I should like to thank your respondant for the time and trougle he has taken in answering my letters. It is a courtesy that has not always been granted to those of us who see the New or Post-conciliar Church as something substantially different from the Catholic Church that has existed throughout history. I shall try in what follows to answer him on a paragraph for paragraph basis and have therefore taken the liberty of numbering his passages.

1 While I agree with your respondant about an individual's conscience being the proximate norm of morality (an issue I never raised), I can in no way accept his contention that my position is in any way based on my private or individual conscience. I made it abundantly clear on page 17 of my initial letter that I took my position because I had an obligation in conscience as a Roman Catholic to do so. I have quoted a great many sources to show that my position is heart and soul a Roman Catholic one. Your respondant may have corrected some of my factual errors, but he has in no way shown that my position is un-Catholic - not even on a single issue.

For him to suggest that I am "invincibly ignorant" is for him to imply that I am not Catholic. Since there is no point of Catholic faith that I deny, in what pray am I ignorant? He may contend that in my refusal to "obey" the present Pontiff on certain issues (i.e. those that depart from the traditional teaching of the Church), I am not Catholic. But I have demonstrated with five pages of quotations (in my initial letter) that there are circumstances in which a faithful Catholic may refuse to obey a Pope - indeed, must refuse to obey him. The issue that remains to be resolved between us is whether the present circumstances are such as to justify my stand or not. He has in no way shown that they are not. He notes that I have a habit of consulting publications which have taken a stand similar to my own. Since most of the authorities I have chosen to agree with on substantial issues are clearly Catholic (after all, most of my selections from Post-conciliar authors are to demonstrate how the New Church has departed from the traditional teachings of the Church), I can only conclude that my "invincibility" shares good and profitable company.

I must also take exception to his suggestion that I may not have exercised "due dilligence" in forming my conscience. After all, I was a "member" of the New Church for many years, and even a member of a parish liturgy committee. (I was invited to become a Deacon as well as "An Extraordinary minister of the Eucharist"). When I became doubtful about the teachings of the New Church and began to have doubts about the validity of the New "mass", I did the only reasonable thing possible. I examined the issue on both sides. I read the writings of those who spoke for and against the changes. I then turned to the traditional theologians of the Church and examined what the Church had taught throughout the ages on the various issues. On all issues where disagreement existed I have chosen as my judge and final arbitrator, the traditional teachings of the Church. What other norm for truth would he have me choose? How else would he have had me act?

In any event, your respondant's entire first section remains an argument ad hominum, and as such is entirely beside the point. Either the basis for my "disobedience" is justified or it is not. The dispute is not with me on a personal basis, but with the theologians that I quote. If there is anything that I pray God for constantly, it is that I may be purged of all "personal" opinions, except in so far as I make the opinions of the Church of All Times "my own." Personal opinions are a luxury that springs from self love, and as St. Catherine of Sienna taught, "Self love... is the principle and foundation of every evil."

2 I fail to see any connection between my paragraph 4 (second letter) and the "notae theologica" that your respondant refers to. I nevertheless do recognize that there are "distinctions" and degrees of certitude and indeed think the passage he sent me (taken from Perente's Theologica Fundamentalis) is so significant that I shall translate most of it:

> "Truths of the (Catholic) faith enjoy different degrees of certitude - whence it follows that diverse theological distinctions (notae) are made.
>
> a) Maximum certitude is to be found in formal dogma which is truth divinely and formally revealed and as such set forth either in the solemn or in the ordinary magisterium. This kind of truth is called fide definita or fide catholica and to reject it is heresy (haeresi).
>
> b) Following closely on this is revealed truth, not as yet so defined by the Church, and which is refered to as proxima fidei, and to deny which is proximum haeresi.
>
> c) The third level falls to truth that is virtually revealed (virtualiter revelata), which is to say, it is derived from what is revealed, but with the help of reason (conclusio theologica or a theological conclusion). Such then are the truths of theological certitude (theologica certa) or pertaining to the faith (ad fidem pertinens), and these are so intimately connected with dogma that to deny them is a theological error or an error in faith (error theologicus seu in fide).
>
> d) Next are the non revealed truths, but truths nevertheless connected with revelation which the opinion of the theologians (sententia theologorum) refer to as communis (common, general, universal, ordinary, usual), and to deny such is termed temerous (temeraria).

Finally other theological censures are mentioned that range from "equivocal, deceitful, scandalous to pernicious and dangerous."

Returning to your respondant's own words, it would seem that his position is that:

> "Only a teaching which the Church has defined as being part of God's revealed truth cannot be changed. Other teachings can and do change..."

This is a position that he reiterates in several places such as paragraph 4 on page 26. If I understand him correctly, he has no objection to being in proximum haeresi, or in error theologicus seu in fide, providing nothing of the fide definita is changed. As for myself, to even hold a temerous opinion would be a grave cause for concern.

He further exemplifies his position by giving examples of teachings that can change such as those that relate to the eternal salvation of unbaptized infants. I always thought that they were deprived of the beatific vision. I am perfectly content, along with many Church Fathers, to leave them and the issue in limbo. I was not aware however that the New Church had proposed any changes with regard to "personal judgment after death," or that it was even conceivable that such a dogma could be changed. It is precisely because of my fear of the personal judgment after death that I refuse to change my faith, even in areas that would be temerous.*

---

* With regard to your respondant's statement that the New Church can change its teaching about "personal judgment after death," let me say that I admit it is true. The New Church can. The Church that Christ founded cannot. It states in Ecclus. xi:28 that "it is easy before God in the day of death to reward everyone according to his ways," and in Luke xvi:22 that "the rich man also died, and was buried in Hell." No less an authority than Msgr. Joseph Pohle has said that "the essential point in the Catholic dogma of the particular judgment is that the soul becomes aware of God's decision immediately after death." There are of course two Judgments, the Particular, immediately following death, and the General or Last Judgment at the end of the world. Now the reasons for a double judgment, and whether or not "sentence" will be passed at the time of the particular

...over

Finally, your respondant refers me to Pope John XXIII's introduction to the Council. I am not sure just what passages he refers to but would like to quote one sentence from it which seems most pertinent:

> "The greatest concern of the Ecumenical Council is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously..."

I take no exception to this and would point out that if the statements quoted on page 12 of my first letter are true (and they are), then the Second Vatican Council was as traitorous to Pope John as it was to the true Catholic Church. Again, I quote Cardinal Suenens:

> "It is possible to draw up an impressive list of theses which Rome has taught in the past and up until yesterday as being the only valid ones, but which the Council Fathers have thrown out."

3 If my terminology is "loose" I can only apologize. I am not a theologian, but a layman and the father of several children. Fortunately, it is not incumbant upon every Catholic to be a theologian - though it is incumbant upon every Catholic to be aware of the issues that divide us and to take a stand upon them. On the other hand, I have shown the passage in question to several individuals, both lay and theologically trained, and they have all stated that my meaning is quite clear.

4 Again, as in 3, my meaning is quite clear. Again, your respondant declares his position that the New Church has not changed any de fide definita propositions and that all other truths that the Church has held and taught, providing they are not de fide definita, are subject to change. If I understand the import of such a position, the New Church can declare that things divinely revealed but not declared de fide can be changed. Such I agree would certainly seem to be the position of the New Church, though I find it hard to believe that anyone would openly declare it. In any event, it would seem to me that such a position is to say the least, itself proximum haeresi! In any event, it is a position that no faith-ful Catholic can accept. This is certainly not the teaching of the traditional Church, and if nothing else divided our two positions, this single issue certainly does.

This issue is of some importance because it is precisely on this point that the New Church has declared itself SCHISMATIC and surrended its claim to UNITY. Let us consider the teaching of the traditional Church taken from Canons 1322, 23, and 24:

> "Christ, our Lord entrusted to the Church the deposit of faith, in order that, by the continual assistance of the Holy Ghost, she might preserve the revealed doctrine and expound it faithfully... All those truths which are contained in the written word of God, or in tradition, and proposed to our belief as divinely revealed either by a solemn proclamation or by the ordinary and universal magisterium of the Church must be believed by Divine and Catholic faith... It is not enough to eschew heretical depravity, but those errors also must be carefully avoided which more or less closely approach heresy."

Father Augustine, in his commentary on these canons states:

---

*Continued from footnote on previous page:
judgment rather than at the time of the Last Judgment are areas in which theologians (and even laymen) can speculate. The Church may even define (in her Wisdom and in accordance with tradition) certain details relating to those at present speculative areas. But to "define" is in no sense to "change".

> "The Deposit of the faith is defined as comprising all the truths which are either implicitly or explicitly contained in the written word of God or in tradition and must be believed as revealed with divine faith... In a wider sense the deposit of the faith comprises also those truths which, though not revealed, bear such an intimate relation to revealed truths that, without them, the latter could not be, at least easily and fully, preserved, expounded and defended."

He further continues, with regard to those truths that are not directly and explicitly contained in Revelation, but only virtually (virtualiter) deducted therefrom by logical reasoning, "some writers have asserted that they must be believed fide ecclesiastica only... Even the so-called fides ecclesiastica requires not a mere servile silence, but a real assent, elicited by the will, although the formal reason, the auctoritas Dei loquentis (the authority of God's spoken word) may not be implied." *

Now, to review our previous discussions: I have stated that Vatican II has in effect changed a great many teachings of the Church and given as evidence the complete reversal of its stand on several issues delineated in the Syllabus of Errors. I could of course find evidence that the stand taken in the Syllabus is that which the Church has always taken, and indeed must take if it is not to "defect" from its function as guardian of the deposit of the faith, and use the Syllabus as a convenient summary. I have also given quotations from Cardinal Suenens and Willebrands as further evidence. However, it would seem that your respondant grants my contention. Many of these changes (they are "changes" and not "developments") relate to teachings once considered part of the ordinary or universal magisterium, and it would seem that your respondant also concurs in this. His defense is that I cannot show that Vatican II has taught anything that is against de fide definita or agains the solemn magisterium. I must suppose that he would not hold that active communicatio in sacris (common worship with heretics) is against de fide definita even though St. Paul instructed us to "Bear not the yoke with unbelievers," and even though it is against the First Commandment in so far as it involves us in a false form of worship. The same comment can be made about "religious freedom" which Vatican II teaches is a moral right (not just a legal right) as if God gave man the moral right to be in heresy!** (This is not to deny that a non-Catholic can be saved by the power of God if he is in a stant of "invincible ignorance" etc., - but if man has a moral right to be invincibly ignorant, than you cannot contend that he should use any "due dilligence" that would interfere with this moral right, and if you believe all that Vatican II teaches about religious freedom, why do you condemn with such intollerence an individual like Archbishop Lefebvre?)

Let me quote a passage from Vatican II:

> "The brethren divided from us also carry out many of the sacred actions of the Christian religion. Undoubtedly, in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or Community, these actions can truly engender a life of grace and can rightly be described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation."

If you believe this, pray tell me why anyone should bother to be a Catholic

---

** The function of the Church, if I may so express it, is not to guarantee our freedom to be in error, but rather on the contrary, to guarantee that if we faithfully follow its teachings, we will be free from error.

* Rev. P. Chas. Augustine, "A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law," B. Herder: New York, 1921, Vol. VI

Even though I recognize that your respondant will not recognize the binding authority of the Encyclical Mortalium Animos (Pope Pius XI), I shall nevertheless quote it at some length for the sake of traditional Catholics:

> "In matters of faith it is not permitted to make a distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental articles of faith, as if the first ought to be held by all, and the second, the faithful are free to accept or not. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal cause the authority of God the Revealer, which suffers not such a division.
> "Therefore, as many as are of Christ give, for example, to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception the same faith they give to the mystery of the August Trinity and they believe in the Incarnation of the Word no differently than they believe in the infallible teaching power of the Pope, in the sense defined by the Vatican Ecumenical Council (I).
> "Not because the Church has defined and sanctioned truths by solemn decree of the Church at different times, and even in times near to us, are they therefore not equally certain and not equally to be believed. For has not God revealed them all?

Further, the Encyclical continues to teach that the Church "has the duty to proceed opportunely in defining points of faith with solemn rites and decrees, when there is a need to declare them to resist more effectively the errors and the assaults of heretics or to impress upon the minds of the faithful clearer and more profound explanations of points of sacred doctrine. However, in this extraordinary use of the teaching authority nothing is invented nor is anything new added to the sum of truths tha are, at least implicitly, contained in the deposit of divine revelation that was entrusted by God to the Church. Instead points of faith are defined that could by chance still seem obscure to some or truths are established as matters of faith that for the first time were called into question." This is the teaching of the Church!

Any way the New Church wishes to "cut the cake," the Syllabus of Errors reflected the the mind of the ordinary and universal teaching magisterium. The idea that the universal ordinary magisterium of the Church can change - especially when it condemns as erroneous a series of heretical propositions, is itself a "heretical innovation" (for the Fathers of the Church often couple these two words). Listen to the words of Msgr. Pohle:

> "Though we can adduce no express dogmatic definition in support of this thesis (any thesis), it must be accepted as an article of faith, because it is taught by the universal magisterium of the Church, which in its turn, voices the manifest teaching of Scripture and Tradition..."

Now, if we are to reject any of the truths of the Catholic faith, we will soon end up by rejecting them all. As Pope Leo XIII said in his Sapientiae Christianae:

> "to refuse to believe in any one of them (points of doctrine) is equivalent to rejecting them all."

And this clearly follows from your respondant's position, for having rejected some (perhaps I should say many, though not all) of the teachings of the Church, he must also deny the concept that THE CHURCH NEVER CONTRADICTS HERSELF. To do so is to deny the doctrine of INDEFECTABILITY. And further, where is all this to stop? If all the writings of the Popes contained in their Encyclicals (apart from those proclaiming dogma infallibly) are to be considered fair game to the modernists; and to be considered as of no lasting value (unless they agree with Vatican II or the present usurpers), then the same applies to almost everything that the Post-conciliar Church has proclaimed. You cannot have your cake and eat it. If you claim that at some future time the Church can change the teachings of Vatican II, just as the Second

Vatican Council has changed the teachings of the traditional Church, then please explain to me why the so-called truths of Vatican II should have any permanent value to my immortal soul. This concept that THE CHURCH CAN AND DOES CONTRADICT ITSELF in accordance with the "needs of the time," or for any other reason you can think up, is pure Relativism and Pragmatism. It is plain and simply NOT Catholic. Our Catholic faith is a gift from God. Unlike a Christmas gift, we cannot take it back and exchange it for something we like better. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of Lights, with whom there is no change, nor shadow of alteration." (James 1:17). Where the New Church teaches the Apostolic faith, I accept it; what it has changed, I reject. So help me God!

5 GENERAL COMMENT: Before going further, it would be useful for us to consider the issue of the Mass. I shall divide my discussion into two divisions: first, the Words of Consecration; and second, the setting in which these words are used. Let us first of all place the formula for the Words of Consecration as taken from the traditional rite, side by side with the new formula taken from the Novus Ordo Missae

Traditional form

FOR THIS IS MY BODY... FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.

Novus Ordo Missae

THIS IS MY BODY WHICH WILL BE GIVEN UP FOR YOU... THIS IS THE CUP OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND EVERLASTING COVENANT. IT WILL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR ALL MEN SO THAT SINS MAY BE FORGIVEN. DO THIS IN MEMORY OF ME.
(Note in passing that in the vernacular these words are no longer capitalized, so that one cannot distinguish them in any way from the rest of the "narrative of the Institution" in which setting they are given.)

Now, your respondant states that "if the writer (myself) does not prove the INVALIDITY, then he has no ground for asserting that the changes are in the "substance." In so stating the case, he has either reversed his words, or else he entirely confuses the issue (which I doubt). Clearly, I must show a change in the "substantia" if I would prove Invalidity. Actually, I must show even more. To quote St. Thomas Aquinas:

> "Now it is clear that, if any substantial part of the sacrament form be suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed; and consequently the sacrament is invalid." (Summa III, Q. 60, Art. 1)

Now, I ask you to turn to page 18 of my second letter. I have quoted Pope Leo XIII to the effect that "the Church is forbidden to change, or even touch, the matter or form of any sacrament." I admit there that you will contend that this is just an opinion and not de fide definita. I then proceed to give several quotations (including one from the Council of Trent*) which make it clear that "to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments." Even the quotation you refer to several times (Denzinger 931 or the second chapter of the XXI Session of the Council of Trent) includes the phrase with regard to the sacramental form "their substance being unchanged."

* Some have maintained that the Chapters or "preambles" of the Council of Trent are not de fide, but only the Canons. However, since your respondant himself quotes from these preambles (Denzinger 931), he can hardly claim to take this position.

I fully agree with your respondant when he says in section 8 of his response that the criteria for judging validity are "matter, form, subject, minister and intention." Subject would apply in the Sacrament of Pennance or Confession, but is not pertinent to the present discussion.

Let us first of all discuss the issue of FORM. Form refers to the form-ula or sequence of words used. Among the 76 different forms used in the different known liturgies (current or ancient, and in many languages) that are recognized as Valid, grea similarity persists. Some have the phrase 'which will be given up for you," and others omit the phrase "mysterium fidei." The other differences are minor. In the Roman Church the traditional form used has been fixed since time immemorial. The sequence of words are said to have been us by Christ in specie - that is in minute detail. (The words Mysterium fidei were added, according to Tradition, by the Apostles, an addition that was entirely within their function to make - and this fact perhaps explain why these two words are not to be found in all the 76 known "forms".) This form has been fixed since Apostolic times and definitely determined since the so-called Armenian decree of the Ecumenical Council of Florence. This form has never in any way been dependent upon Scripture. As Cardinal Manning said:

> "We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them. Our faith was in the world before the New Testament was written."

Indeed, even the reference your respondant suggests as authoritative, namely Jungmann's The Mass of the Roman Rite, teaches us that the Form of the Roman Canon dates back to pre-Biblical times. As Jungmann says:

> "In all the known liturgies the core of the eucharistia, and therefore of the Mass, is formed by the narrative of the institution and the words of consecration. Our very first observation in this regard is the remarkable fact that the texts of the account of institution, among them in particular the most ancient (whether as handed down or as reconstructed by comparative studies), are never simply a Scripture text restated. They go back to pre-Biblical tradition. Here we face an outgrowth of the fact that the Eucharist was celebrated long before the evangelists and St. Paul set out to record the Gospel story. Even the glaring discrepancies of the Biblical texts themselves regarding this very point are explained by this fact. For in them we evidently find segments from the liturgical life of the first generation of Christians." *

This same form was confirmed as pointed out in my previous letters, by the Council of Trent, and specified at the Council's orders in the Catechism of the Council of Trent.**

To change the form of course is not to invalidate the form, even though to do so is to disobey the laws of the Church. This we can show from the teaching of St. Thomas.***

---

* Such also is the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas

** This Catechism, written after the Council closed, at the Council's instructions and under the supervision of St. Charles Borromeo, enjoys a unique authority. As Dr. Hogan (former head of the Irish College in Rome) stated, "at the very least, it has the same authority as a dogmatic encyclical."

*** To quote L'Osservatore Romano, January 7, 1971, "St. Thomas is named by the (second Vatican) Council in the most explicit way, as the teacher to be followed in specifically theological thought, that is thought seeking the understanding of the mysteries, as far as is possible, and in contemplating the connection between the revealed truths. This is tantamount to recognizing the superiority of St. Thomas in certainty and depth of doctrine."

> "Thus in the form of the Eucharist, - for this is My Body... the omission of the word for... does not cause the sacrament to be invalid; although perhaps he who makes the omission may sin from negligence or contempt." (Summa III, Q. 60, Art. 8).

In any event, one thing is clear from what has been so far said. THE NEW AND POST-CONCILIAR CHURCH HAS CHANGED THE FORM OF THE SACRAMENT. This is a dastardly act whether or not INVALIDITY results. In thus attacking the heart of the Mass, the New Church both declares herself and exposes herself to be a "despoiler" of all that is most sacred. My God, in this one act she has presumed to alther the very words traditionally ascribed to Christ; she has gone against Tradition and Apostolic custom; she has altered the customs and disciplines adhered to by the Fathers of the Church and innumerable saints; she has disregarded the teachings of the Ecumenical Councils (including the Council of Trent); and she has disobeyed innumerable laws and statements to be found in the various organs of the teaching Magisterium. When she is reprimanded, she loudly protests that "it is Valid, it is more Scriptural, it is adapted to the needs of modern man and it helps promote unity!" If the New Church can thus attack the very heart of the Mass, all the other things she is doing by comparison are minor. Remember however that to attack is not necessarily to destroy, and with this she could hardly remain satisfied.

We will consider next the issue of SUBSTANTIA. What then is the substance of the form of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. According to St. Thomas:

> "Some have maintained that the words 'This is the Chalice of My Blood' alone belong to the substance of the form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words that follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of the expression. And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to words 'As often as ye shall do this.' (but not including these words, for the priest puts down the chalice when he comes to them - writer) Hence it is that the priest pronounces all the words, under the same rite and manner, holding the chalice in his hands." (Summa III, Q. 78, Art.

Most theologians of the Church agree with this position, namely that the form of the sacrament has been fixed since time immemorial, and that the substance includes all of the above specified words. Admittedly there are some such as St. Bonaventura and Cajetan who hold that "This is the chalice of My Blood" would suffice for Validity, though it should be noted in passing that when Pope Saint Pius V ordered the works of Cajetan to be published, he also ordered that this opinion (and only this opinion) should be struck from them. Furthermore, even the Cajetan thomists admit that these latter words (i.e. 'Which shall be shed for you and for many...") do indeed belong to the substance of the form, even though they deny their necessity for Validity. That is to say, they distinguish between what is of the substance and what is of the essence. Hence they assert that while these latter words are not essential for the validity of the Sacrament, they are nevertheless necessary for the integrity or completeness of the form, and therefore belong to the substance. It would appear then, that the New Church has not only attacked and changed the Form of the Sacrament; it has also altered the Substance! In doing so it adds injury to insult. In doing so however, it still has not destroyed potential validity. (I say "potential" because, like your respondant, I recognize that Minister, Intention and Matter must be considered also.) And such an act is clearly illicit, for it goes against the Laws of the Church and as such is contrary to the will of God.*

*As Joseph Pohle says, in his Dogmatic Treatise on "The Sacraments," "Had the Church received from her Divine Founder the power to institute Sacraments, whe would also have the power of changing the substance of any sacrament... But this is not so..."

Despite all this, I still hear the voice of your respondant crying out "You have not yet proved any INVALIDITY!" And I agree. In order to show invalidity, I must show that the alterations in the substance of the form ALTER THE MEANING. The mind of the Church is quite clear on this as is shown by the Catechism of the Council of Trent and by Chapter V of De Defectibus (the official rubrics accompanying St. Pope Pius V's Roman Missal) where it states:

> "If anyone omits or changes anything in the form of consecration of the Body and Blood, and in this change of words, the words do not mean the same thing, then he does not effect the Sacrament. If words are added which do not alter the meaning, then the sacrament is valid, but the celebrant commits a mortal sin in making such an addition."

It would appear then that "merely" altering the substance, that is omitting a word or a phrase from the substance of the form (or adding one) would not per se invalidate the Sacrament. Only if the change in the substance altered the meaning does INVALIDITY result. This is also the opinion of St. Thomas.

> "In the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey... we must see whether the change in words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the Sacrament is clearly rendered invalid." (Summa III, Q. 60, Art. 8)

To this point we have only shown that the Form and Substance of the sacrament have been changed. We have not shown that the meaning has been altered. This perhaps explains why the Church has never denied the validity of variant forms that for instance omit the words mysterium fidei. Now it becomes incumbent upon me to show that the change of words "destroys the essential sense of the words."

As St. Thomas states,"the words which follow 'This is My body... This is My blood," are determinations of the predicate." Thus, if the priest were to say "This is My body, and I mean by this statement a symbol and not the reality," clearly he would not consecrate because the second phrase would alter the meaning of the predicate. In the Novus Ordo Missae, the substitution of the words "for all men" in place of "for many" clearly alters the meaning of the predicate and thus "the essential sense of the words is destroyed." This being so, according to the opinion of St. Thomas, it follows that "THE SACRAMENT IS CLEARLY RENDERED INVALID."

Now, as I anticipated in my second letter, you will argue that "many" means "all," or something along these lines. You will say that philological studies prove there was no such word for "all" in Aramaic, or that when Christ said "many," he really meant "all." I have heard all these arguements and have checked the philological reference you give in section 30 (Zerwick, Analysis Philologica Novi Testamenti Graeci). And to all this I say "rot." Even a child can distinguish between the meaning of "all" and "many". None of the 76 forms of the Words of Consecration known to us use this mistranslation (or more correctly, FORGERY) and they are to be found in a wide variety of languages. The first "scholar" to suggest such a foolish falsification of Scripture and Tradition was, as far as I can tell, Joachim Jeremias, and it is this individual that ICEL ("The International Committee for English in the Liturgy"*) cites as its authority on this point. Needless to say, Dr. Jeremias was a Protestant. Does your respondant really believe that the Apostles and the early saints were not intelligent enough to understand the distinction? As far as I know, even the new translations of Scripture have not changed any of the manys into alls, but does your respondant really believe that the "Vulgate translation from which our Latin texts come is not as clear

* An excellent analysis of the machinations of ICEL is available under the title of "The Liturgy Club," by Gary K. Potter in Triumph, May 1968 . Triumph is the official publication of "Catholics United for the Faith," a conservative New Church group that accepts the Novus Ordo Missae as both Valid and Appropriate.

as it could be" on this simple issue? After all, as St. Thomas tells us (quoting De. Consecr.) "James the brother of the Lord according to the flesh, and Basil, Bishop of Caesarea, edited the rite of celebrating the Mass" (Summa III, Q. 83, Art. 4). I enclose as Appendix 1 a discussion on this issue by Patrick Henry Omlor which will provide the reader with an excellent philological analysis of the question.

Returning to more serious things, to understand how all men changes the sense of the words one must understand the difference between Efficacy and Sufficiency. It is a truth of our Faith that Christ died for all men without exception. "And He is the propitiation of our sins: and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world" (1 John ii:2). Thus His act has sufficiency. It is also a truth that not all men are saved, but some indeed suffer eternal damnation, and hence it follows that the efficacy or effectiveness of Christ's act is not communicated to all men, but only unto those who are actually saved. This is why St. Thomas states in Summa III, Q. 78, Art. 3 and elsewhere that for all men was NOT used, and for many was. Such was hardly a "slip of the tongue" or a casual opinion, for the same point is clearly expressed by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, by St. Alphonsus Liguori and by Pope Benedict XIV. Your respondant can argue that this opinion is not de fide definita, but he cannot show any contrary opinion that is de fide definita, and he cannot defend any contrary opinion from the traditional theologians of the Church. This opinion of St. Thomas expresses the constant and continuous mind of the Church. And if your respondant wishes to throw out everything in this Catechism that is not de fide definita, then clearly he and I are not in the same Church. (The pertinent passages from the Catechism of the Council of Trent and from the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori are quoted on pages 19 and 20 of my second letter.)

At various points in his latest letter your respondant suggests that the only thing that is ESSENTIAL to validity are the essential words "This is My body...This is My blood." Certainly, I agree that they are essential and indeed one could prove the point, for these words are present in all 76 forms of the Sacramental form known to us. To state that they are alone essential for Validity is at best a mere theological opinion, and a doubtful one at that. Hence in the practical order it would be sinful to use these words alone as a "form," for one cannot use a doubtful form when one knows a certain one. In any event, the Novus Ordo does not use this form in isolation, but in circumstances where the secondary clause is a determinant of the predicate. To argue that the Novus Ordo retains what is essential by keeping these words is as false as to say that a person who states "He does not believe in God" is not an atheist because his statement contains the words "He does... believe in God!" No wonder then that the theologians teach "Omit nothing of the form, add nothing, change nothing, beware of transmuting, corrupting, or interrupting the words." (J.M. Herve's Manuale Theologiae Dogmatica).*

It might help us to see the seriousness of all this if we consider for a moment the MATTER of the Sacrament. The matter refers to the bread and wine, the material that is transubstantiated.

* What has Pope Paul VI to say about all this? Let me quote him. "It would be well to understand the motives for such a great change introduced (in the Mass)... It is the will of Christ, it is the breath of the Spirit calling the Church to this mutation..." (General Audience, Nov. 26, 1969). Now the Pope in using the term "mutation," quite apart from the scientific implications of abnormality, has used a term familiar to anyone trained in theology. It is the term used in discussion just these issues that can invalidate the sacrament. To quote Father Felix Cappello, S.J. of the Gregorian University in his text De Sacramentis: "Mutatio substantialis materiae aut formae, semper reddit invalidum sacramentum. Accidentalis, contra, nunquam officit valori sacramenti; sed solum culpam inducit, gravem vel levem, modo voluntaria sit, pro mutationis gravitate aut parvitate... Mutatio substantialis in forma contingit, quando sensus verborum non idem manet; accidentalis, cum verba eundam sensum retinent."

> "In the sacraments determinate sensible things are required which are as the sacramental matter, much more is there need in them (the sacraments) of a determinate form of words." (Summa III, Q. 60, Art. 7).

Now the matter of the sacrament is at least as important as the form. I wonder what your respondant's reaction would be to the changing of the MATTER. Perhaps, with wine getting more expensive and difficult to obtain, we should use coca-cola! As long as the New Church were to mandate such a change of wine to coca-cola "legally," I cannot see why it would in any way disturb him.

(I discuss INTENTION at a later point in this letter, and assume that we can agree that by MINISTER we mean a properly ordained priest. However, perhaps I should specify by a properly ordained priest I do not mean an Anglican or a Lutheran minister.)

SUBJECT refers to the Recepient as in Confession, the person who receives absolution. Since in the Sacrament of the Eucharist no recepient other than the priest is essential, SUBJECT need not be discussed.

From all that we have said, it follows that when the Words of Consecration in the Novus Ordo Missae are said in Latin, no essential change in meaning is necessarily present. Hence, providing the intention, minister and matter are appropriate, and providing the minister understands and means many when he says multis, and disregarding for the present the setting within which these words are said, Consecration may well occur. When however these words are said in the vernacular (I can speak from experience only of English Italian German and French), one can in justice, be most doubtful as to whether any consecration whatsoever occurs. Remember, one cannot knowingly use a doubtful form when one knows the certain one. And, may I ask, how often are we given the Novus Ordo in Latin? "Over my dead body," as our local pastor said to a group of us that requested it because of this issue!

The charge of invalidity of the Novus Ordo is a very great charge indeed, yet it is one that has been constantly made since the new service was promulgated some nine years ago. Your respondant cannot refute this accusation. In practice, THE VERY RAISING OF QUESTIONS OR DOUBTS ABOUT THE VALIDITY OF A GIVEN MANNER OF CONFECTING A SACRAMENT - IF THIS QUESTION IS BASED ON AN APPARENT DEFECT OF MATTER OF FORM - WOULD NECESSITATE THE STRICT ABSTENTION FROM USE OF THAT DOUBTFUL MANNER OF PERFORMING THE SACRAMENTAL ACT, UNTIL THE DOUBTS ARE RESOLVED. The same statement would apply pari pasu to the laity receiving the doubtful sacrament. IN CONFECTING THE SACRAMENTS, ALL PRIESTS ARE OBLIGED TO FOLLOW THE "MEDIUM CERTUM."*

Finally, let me also note in passing that none of the changes made in the Mass by Paul VI are de fide definita. He made this quite clear in his Allocution of Nov. 26, 1969.

****

THE SETTING IN WHICH THE WORDS OF CONSECRATION ARE USED

As I have said above, in Latin, the Words of Consecration (in the Novus Ordo) may under certain circumstances be valid. The setting in which the priest consecrates however, is by no means an idle or irrelevant issue. Again, let us listen to the Angelic Doctor:

---

* I am indebted to Patrick Henry Omlor's book "Questioning the Validity of the Masses using the New All-Englich Canon," Athanasius Press, Reno, Nevada, 1969 for many of these points. This excellent text, written by a layman, a mathematician and the father of eight children, is available from TAN Books, P.O. Box 424, Rockford Ill., U.S.A.

> "Accordingly, it must be held that if the priest were to pronounce only the aforesaid words (the Words of Consecration) with the intention of consecrating the sacrament, this sacrament would be valid because the intention would cause these words to be understood as spoken in the person of Christ, even though the words are pronounced without those that preceed. The priest however would sin gravely in consecrating thus as he would not be observing the rite of the Church." (Summa III, Q. 78, Art. 1).

The seeting then in which the priest uses these words becomes important. Thus, to take an extreme example, a priest who desired to consecrate in a completely sacrilegious context such as a "Black Mass" would hardly be intending to "do what the Church intends," and hence the validity of the Consecration would be most doubtful. Similarly, if a priest were to say the Lutheran service in which the Words of Institution (i.e. of Consecration) are to be found, he would be committing a sacrilege and the consecration would be at best extremely doubtful. The setting then is most important and must be examined with care to be sure that it is appropriate.

Of course sacrilege has become so common in the New Church that it is almost "normative," a statement that can be verified by going to the Novus Ordo in almost any parish in Europe or America. The laity have become so innured to gross acts of disrespect shown to the Sacred Species that they no longer even react to things that 20 years ago would have created a riot. Of course your respondant will admit that such sacrileges do occur, but he will claim that they are "abuses". While I believe that they are the natural consequence of all the changes that the New Church has forced down the throats of the laity, I will not argue the point. I do however wish to raise a specific issue: namely DO THOSE PRIESTS WHO CONSECRATE IN LATIN, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE NOVUS ORDO MISSAE, COMMIT A SACRILEGE? I realize of course that many of them act in good faith and that as such no sacrilege can be personally imputed to them. Sacrilege is, according to the words of St. Thomas Aquinas quoted by the Catholic Encyclopedia, "the irreverand treatment of sacred things," In his discussion of sacrilege, St. Thomas makes several distinctions, and notes that since the Eucharist is the most sacred possession of the Church, sacrilege with regard to this sacrament is "a most heinous sin." (Summa III. Q. 80, Art 5.) In view of all that can be said about the New Erzatz Canons, and the virtually verbatum imitation of the liturgies of the various heretical sects that reject the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and indeed at heart hate the Church itself, I think an excellent case can be made for the charge.

Let us for a moment examine the setting in which the New Words of Consecration (or the "Narrative of the Institution" as the Novus Ordo ambiguously refers to them*). The following section is taken from Father Wathen's book, "The Great Sacrilege": I apologize for the length of the quotation, but I cannot phrase the topic better. **

> In order to concentrate on the words in question, I am taking no notice of the many gestures of too-poor reverence, the purposeful silence, the ineffable intimacy, the awe-inspired deliberateness, that the *Missale Romanum* requires of the tremulous celebrant, all of which are regarded as archaic, anti-social, and in bad taste by the "desacralizers."

---

* The phrase "Words of Institution" are traditional, but are used preferentially by the reformers and the neo-reformers because the avoid any doctrinal implication

** TAN Books, Rockford, Ill., 1971. This book has never received an adequate respons or refutal from the New Church, despite the fact that it contains an open challenge to the New Church to debate the issues at any time and in any place.

Before all else, it must be understood that the *Qui Pridie* and the Form of Consecration in the True Mass are, neither singly nor taken together, *a mere narration of the event of the Last Supper.* The *Qui Pridie* is the setting and the preparation for *pronouncement* of the Consecration formula, as well as the prayer wherein the celebrant bears witness to the essential unity of the institution of the Sacrament with the Sacrifice of the Cross. Fr. Joseph Jungmann points out that all liturgies do the same:

> It is in the very nature of the Christian liturgy of the Mass that the account of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament should not be recited as a merely historical record, as are other portions of the Gospels. Indeed, the words of the account are spoken over the bread and a chalice, and, in accord with our Lord's word, are uttered precisely in order to repeat Christ's action. This repetition, is, in fact, accomplished in all its essentials by rehearsing the words of the account of the institution.[43]

In the *Qui Pridie,* the Last Supper is mentioned to remind us of the priest's intention of repeating that act by which Christ transubstantiated the bread and wine, so that He might give His Apostles His Body and Blood. When He accomplished this marvelous miracle, the Sacrifice of Calvary was made sacramentally present there in the Upper Room. When the priest at Mass accomplishes the same ineffable wonder, the Body and Blood of Christ become present on the altar. If no transubstantiation took place during the Mass, it would be nothing more than a sentimental memorial of the Last Supper, and imply that the Last Supper itself was nothing more than a dramatic and sorrowful going-away banquet which Christ ate with the Twelve.

The Form of Consecration is not considered to be a prayer of the priest. Rather, it is the evocation of a direct and most glorious act from God Himself. Through his pronunciation of the Consecration Form, the priest's humanity and individuality become identified with the infinite power and redemptive intention of Christ on the Cross. At this point, the priest speaks as if he were Christ Himself, and Christ acts through the priest's will and words both as the Consecrator and the Oblation, the Eternal High-Priest and the saving Victim, the supreme Mediator and the mutual Gift.

43. *The Mass of the Roman Rite—Its Origins and Development.* Rev. Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J. Benziger Brothers, Inc. New York. 1955. Vol. 2, p. 201.

In the Epiclesis of the True Mass (again, I remind you, this is the prayer which begins, *"Qui pridie"*), the obvious emphasis is on the fact that the priest intends to do what Christ did at the Last Supper, namely, consecrate the offerings, change them into the Body and Blood of the Savior. In the "Epiclesis" of the "New Mass" the emphasis has been obviously and unmistakably shifted, even though the words used are generally the same. Here there is nothing left to indicate that the "president" is actually *consecrating,* or intends to. Traditional-minded Catholics *presume* he is doing so; perhaps he also *presumes* he is doing so—although, again, perhaps he does not; you cannot be certain. While everyone is doing all this presuming, what is really happening is that *the "president" is merely telling what happened at the Last Supper.* Nor is he telling of the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Our Lord; he is telling of the eating and drinking of bread and wine.

Let us look closely at the English of the "New Mass": The Latin text of the *"Narratio"* (in the "New Mass") has three sentences; its faulty translation has six. (Keep in mind that during a vernacular "mass," it makes no difference what the Latin has!)

The simple device of dividing the text into shorter sentences not only reduces it to nothing more than a narrative, but also, changes the meaning of the words, as we shall see. The first sentence contains a reference to the suffering of Christ (the Latin words *"gratias agens,"* let me mention in passing, do not mean "he gave . . . thanks and praise," but, "giving thanks"). Then the second sentence is entirely new: "He broke the bread, gave it to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and eat it: this is my body which will be given up for you." Perhaps you do not see the ambiguity. In the True Mass, the priest says, "Take and eat ye all of this, FOR THIS IS MY BODY." The omission of the word, *"for"* (in the Latin, *"enim"*), and the stopping of the sentence with the colon, make the words *this* and *it* of the faulty translation refer to their antecedant, *bread*. This ambiguity does not exist in the Latin of the *"Novus Ordo"* because *"hoc"* is both neuter and singular and can refer only to the neuter, singular noun, *"Corpus"* (*"Body"*).

The identical distortion is committed in the fourth sentence with reference to the wine. This sentence reads: "Again he gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and drink from it: this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant." Here again the Latin word, *"enim"* (*"for"*) is not translated; a colon is put in its place. The result is that the clauses of the sentence are separated completely. The words *this* and *it* refer to the wine, not to the *"cup of my blood."*

Now consider how the *"Narratio"* in the *"Novus Ordo"* is printed. (We are referring to the Latin text.) The words "ACCIPITE ET MANDUCATE EX HOC OMNES" ("Take this, all of you, and eat it") are given the same bold capitalization as the words of consecration, "HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM," ("this is my body . . ."). It is the same with the words "ACCIPITE ET BIBITE EX EO OMNES:" ("Take this, all of you, and drink from it:"), as also with the words which in liturgical terms are called the *Anamnesis:* "HOC FACITE IN MEAM COMMEMORATIONEM." ("Do this in memory of me.") The reason for the bold and enlarged capitals in the *Missale Romanum* of St. Pius V is the need to separate them from the Epiclesis and the Anamnesis, and to *indicate that they are the Form of Consecration.* This very purpose is undeniably negated in the *"Novus Ordo;"* instead, and this is most important, the capitalization of the words which speak of taking and eating, taking and drinking have the double effect of fusing the words of consecration into the *"Narratio,"* or Narration, and, at the same time, of heightening the importance of the idea of eating and drinking of—not, mind you—the Body and Blood of Christ, but of the bread and wine, which the demonstratives and pronouns logically and grammatically refer to. As we shall see when we discuss the apparently innocuous change of the words of the Anamnesis, *"Haec quotiescumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis"* ("As often as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me") to "HOC FACITE IN MEAM COMMEMORATIONEM" ("Do this in memory of me"), the effect is the very same. *And that effect is the complete eradication of the Form of Consecration.*

This typography is truly radical. Nor can it be the result of the printer's caprice or oversight; it corresponds exactly with the "wishes" of Pope Paul VI himself as he expressed them in his "decree" *Missale Romanum.* Allow me to quote them in their context:

> However, for pastoral reasons, and in order to facilitate concelebration, we have ordered that the words of the Lord ought to be identical

> in each formulary of the Canon. Thus, in each Eucharistic Prayer, we wish that the words be pronounced thus: over the bread: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: Hoc est enim Corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur;* over the chalice: *Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes: Hic est enim calix Sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.* [The Pope's italics]. (Appendix II, par. 6).

The reader will observe that the Pope is careful not to refer to the words quoted above as the "Form of Consecration;" instead, they are described as "the words of the Lord," which must mean the words of the Lord as they are quoted in the *"Narratio,"* the account of the Lord's Supper. Neither here nor anywhere else in his Apostolic Constitution does the Pontiff refer to the mystery of Transubstantiation. From beginning to end, his main emphasis is on the "readings" of the new "missal," with which the people will "nourish themselves day by day."

Pope Paul says, "We have ordered that the words of the Lord ought to be, etc." How is that the Pope may order what the "words of the Lord ought to be?"

Few seem to have noticed the two main reasons the Pope gives for so radical an alteration in the very center of the "mass," but they are there, big as life, "for pastoral reasons, and in order to facilitate concelebration." How many people know to this day what these "pastoral reasons" are, and how the complete emasculation of the Form of Consecration serves to "facilitate concelebration?" Perhaps it will help if they recall that the word "pastoral" in the code language of the Revolution means, "for the people," that is, "for the sake of the 'Renewal' or the Revolution itself." Again, the abandonment of the Form of Consecration and its reduction to a mere narrative can only be understood by realizing that, in many "concelebrated 'masses'" many of the "concelebrants," both "Catholic" and Protestant, certainly do not believe in the power of Transubstantiation. Thanks to this "slight" adjustment, they may use any of the four "Eucharistic Prayers" without the risk of such a marvel occurring.

There is one further argument against the abandoning of the traditional Canon of the Roman Church, and that is that it is an abandonment of "tradition." To make this point with quotations would take several pages and still not convince a modernist - it is however to me an important point.

I am sure of course that your respondant will consider Tradition to be only a matter of dogmatic statement. He will argue that other things such as the customs practices institutions precepts and disciplines of the Church are not strictly speaking "immutable Tradition." This position is parallel to his attitude that only things declared de fide definita are unchangeable. Such a restriction on the use of the word Tradition is of relatively recent origin, and as Cardinal Tixeront says in his History of Dogmas, states that the word Tradition in its primitive sense implies "teaching and custom transmitted by word of mouth or practice." Such an attitude is also to be found in the Canons of the Ecumenical councils - "let everything that conflicts with ecclesiastical tradition and teaching, and that has been innovated and done contrary to the examples outlined by the saints and venerable Fathers, or that shall hereafter at any time be done in such a fashion, be anathema." (Seventh Ecumenica

Council). Even the Council of Trent states "truth and discipline are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions."* And what is meant by "discipline?" Let us turn to St. Thomas Aquinas who quotes Pope Galasius to the effect "that most holy rite (the Mass) which contains the Catholic discipline..." (Summa III, Q. 82, Art. 6. Finally we have the words of Christ Himself: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ..." (Matthew xxviii: 20). Now clearly you do not "observe" a dogma, you observe a custom, and Christ not only gave us the Words of Consecration, but performed several actions such as "breaking the bread" and "elevating the Chalice."

I do not wish to get into a debate about what Tradition constitutes. However you wish to define and sub-define the term, the New "mass" is against Revelation (it changes the very words of Christ); It is against divine and divine-Apostolic Tradition for it has changed the customs and manner of acting that the Apostles instituted (In the traditional Canon, some of the actions and prayers are of Apostolic origin. Since we are not sure which ones, it is best to observe them all); It has changed what Cardinal Bellarmine would call the "matter" as well as the "form" of Tradition (De Verbo Dei); It has changed what Cardinal Franzelin would term "objective and "Active" Tradition (De Devina Traditione); It has changed what other theologians would call constitutive and continuative Tradition. It has certainly changed what every theologian would call Ecclesiastical Tradition. Now the Council of Nicaea states that "anyone who does not accept the whole of the Church's tradition, both written and unwritten, anathema sit!" To abandon our traditions is for a faithful Catholic a most henious crime - it is certainly a prima facie example of "the irreverand treatment of sacred things" which is the definition of Sacrilege. To do this is nothing short of spiritual suicide. Consider for a moment the councilar quotations given above, and the words of Paul VI:

> "It is necessary to know how to welcome with humility and an interior freedom what is innovative; one must break with the habitual attachment to what we used to designate as the unchangeable tradition of the Church..." (La Croix, Sept., 4, 1970)

To be an "untraditional" Catholic is to be no Catholic at all!

end of general comment, and back to a paragraph by paragraph discussion of the issues

5 The question of VALIDITY has been discussed above. Your respondant refers to Denzinger 931 on several occasions as giving the Church the right to make changes in the Mass. Let us examine this passage. Denzinger 931 is Chapter II of the XXI Session of the Council of Trent and deals with the issue of the dispensation of the sacraments.* I shall quote the pertinent passage:

> "It furthermore declares that this power has ever been in the Church, that in dispensation of the sacraments (italics mine), their substance being untouched (nota bene) it may ordain, or change, what things soever it may judge most expedient, for the profit of those who receive, or for the veneration of the said sacraments, according to the difference of circumstances, times and places..."

As your respondant holds that this passage permits the Church to legally change anything it wants in the Mass, I not only give this passage, but in Appendix II the entire chapter. It will become clear from reading the entire chapter, and from reviewing the Canons with anathemas attached to them, that the entire issue under discussion was that of whether it was necessary for salvation for Catholics to

*Denzinger's Enchiridion Symbolorum is a collection of "Definitions and Declarations" of the Church dealing with matters of Faith and Morals. It is a standard reference text originally published in 1854 and one that has gone through innumerable editions. A bad English translation is available, but is long out of print.

receive communion under both species.Against the teaching of Hus and others, it makes it quite clear that such is not the case, and also makes it clear that Christ, "whole and entire... is received under the one species of bread." I have never raised this issue and in no way deny the right of the Church to legislate in such issues. Indeed, when I go to the Ukranian Uniate Mass, I receive under both species (as this privilege has been available in this rite since it was established by St. Chrysostom).

6 Your respondant, instead of admitting that there is not one prayer in the Novus Ordo Missae that is of more ancient usage than the traditional Roman Canon, implies that I have not done my homework. Now, I have read a great many books on the history of the liturgy in my attempt to understand the changes, among them Jungmann's THE MASS OF THE ROMAN RITE. Indeed, I make reference to Jungmann's latest (posthumous) book on the New Mass in my correspondence. The other two books he lists are only available in Italian at the largest seminary on the Eastern seaboard, and hence I have not read them. However, I have read all or parts of some sixty texts on this subject. I do not consider myself an expert, but think I can speak of the issues with some intelligence.

Further, I have given more than ample recognition of the "developments" (not "changes") that have occured throughout history in the Mass on page 3 of my second letter. I have also discussed the difference between "change" and "development" on page 26 of my second letter.

With regard to his statement that "virtually all the changes introduced... are re-introductions of ancient usages," I consider this a falsehood. Before we consider such superficial things as to whether the priest should speak loudly or softly, let us consider the prayers that he says. The core of the Mass - any Mass - must remain the prayers said, and not the accidental ceremonies that surround the prayers. Now, I have challenged your respondant before, and I again challenge him. Show me one prayer (not a section of a prayer since phrases - when not offensive to modernistic or Protestant theologians - are retained) - one prayer that is a return to ancient practice.

Under the excuse of "simplification of format" significant phrases are altered or left out and meanings distorted. By means of the "use of the vernacular" gross mistranslations of even the Latin form of the Novus Ordo are introduced (see section II of this letter for an example). As to saying the Eucharistic prayer aloud, before the introduction of the microphone, the laity never were able to hear them anyway. (Canon IX of Session XXII of the Council of Trent does not forbid him to say them aloud, but does state that a priest cannot be condemned for saying them "in a low tone." I have never objected to triple readings - the faithful can read the Bible any time they wish either in or out of Church. I have not objected to "the prayers of the faithful" (an addition and not a deletion; not possible to fix and hence never part of the Canon, and certainly the faithful prayed at Mass before the Novus Ordo), or to the offertory processions (that occur outside of the Canon). As to communion under both species, clearly as discussed in section 5 above, this is also not a problem in se.

I am glad that at least your respondant and I can agree that the Roman Canon itself is ancient, and even here we both agree that the Popes have added certain phrases. (Again, addition is not deletion.) Thus according to Monsignor Duchesne's researches, St. Gregory added to the prayer Hanc Igitur the phrase Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab aeterna damnatione nos eripi et in electorum tuorum iugeas grege numerari and St. Leo added the phrase Sanctum Sacrificium immaculatam hostiam (440-461) to the form in use at the time of St. Damasus (366-384). Finally, lest we overlook the issue, let me admit that there have been four minor changes in the traditional Mass even after the Quo Primum of Pope Saint Pius V was promulgated - but changes OUTSIDE THE CANON, and of no great significance.

7 With regard to the issue of the "renewed rites" being written with the aid of six non-Catholics, let me first of all admit and apologize for not going back to the

original documentation in the Osservatore Romano. This original is unavailable in either the Fordham University Library or in the Library of Dunwoodie Seminary (the largest seminary in the East). It is also unavailable as yet from the Library of Congress. A friend is trying to obtain it for me from Europe and if successful, I shall include it in Appendix III.

In any event, I never stated that the non-Catholics were members of the Concilium, but only that they aided in writing the Novus Ordo. I thank your respondant for calling my attention to Notitae 1974, pgs. 249-252, which mirablie dictu proves my contention! I enclose a copy of this item as Appendix III for the reader to peruse. It would appear that their formal contribution was minimal. Let me quote a few passages from this document: "they were the first to arrive (at the meetings they attended) and the last to leave the room; they were always pleasant, polite and spoke rarely (parchi di parole)... they always conducted themselves with an unparalleled discretion. They intervened in no discussions but only raised points of order (mai chiesero la parola)." They may not have contributed to the Eucharistic prayers, but their opinion was clearly sought out in other areas and they were asked to address the Concilium on certain issues. One thing comes through clearly: the members of the Concilium were deeply concerned with producing a liturgy that would be pleasing to these heretical observors. One can almost see the members of the Concilium "chopping up" the significant sections of the traditional Mass, and looking up to the observors for approval - and the observors smiling back their encouragement.

Now, I myself have been involved in Symposia in my surgical specialty in which parallel situations have occured. Consultants who have only a to a minimimum participated in the formal aspect of such symposia often spend entire evenings discussing with the formal participants the issues involved. Such discussions can often have a formidible influence upon the actual decisions taken. Even if such cannot be conclusively proven, their participation, however minimal, is clear. It rather reminds one of the invitation to the Russian Communists to be "observors" at Vatican II. Since they have made clear their avowed intention of burying us, why not put shovels into their hands. Can anything be more absurd than to invite those who deny the possibility of the Transubstantiation to be observors at the writing of a service that presumably commemorates this most splendid of God's gifts.

In any event, I do not see this as a critical issue. Certainly, it is scandelous. However the New Church has no need of Protestants to help them produce and support (with the donations of the faithful) a most luxurient crop of heretics. (I am refering now, not to the Mass per se, but to the innumerable theologians in official teaching positions in the New Church, and to any other priest who, while not believing in the full teaching of the Church, and who fails to proclaim this teaching, accepts food and clothing and shelter from those who in essence give the money to Christ.)

8 I strongly object to your respondant placing in quotation marks the statement that "the Mass is valid only if the Eucharistic Prayer is ancient," as these are neither my words, nor my contention. I fully agree with the respondant's statement about form, matter, minister, subject (where appropriate) and intention being the criteria for Validity as shown in section 5 above. It is true that I use the word "antiquity," but only in the same sense as St. Vincent of Lerins does:

> "The antiquity was retained, the novelty was exploded."
>
> (Commonit., 1:6)

9 I strongly object to your respondant stating that my position is that "the new rites were written with the aid of six non-Catholics and are therefore invalid." In so stating the case, he creates a "straw man," and then proceeds to burn it. Moreover

it is a technique that allows him to avoid the real issues. Thus in the paragraph in question he avoids discussing the terrible statement of Paul VI to the effect that in the Novus Ordo, its perpetrators

> "re-edited in a new manner liturgical texts tried and tested by long usage or established formulas which are completely new... (thus) imparting greater theological value to the liturgical texts so that the lex orandi conformed better with the lex credendi."

As I noted then, and again note, either the Pope is stating that the Lex credendi has changed, or that the liturgical texts prior to 1969 did not possess that degree of theological value which was desirable!

The fact that the Protestants had anything to do with writing the Novus Ordo is scandalous, but does not per se make the new "mass" invalid. If however the new "mass" teaches false doctrine (if the lex credendi or manner of our believing has been changed), then its use by the priest (and attending it by the laity) becomes an offence against God. The true Church has always rejected the "mass" of Luther, a "mass" that contained "valid" words of institution, and certainly one that contains the "essential" words according to your respondant's opinion. It rejected it because these words were said in a context that was considered both sacriligous and heretical. For a priest to intentionally say the Lutheran "mass" and for him to intend to Consecrate with the Lutheran "Words of Institution" would be sacrilegous and the mass would not be, despite the use of the words "This is My body... etc" in any way valid.

What is particularly offensive is that your respondant repeatedly uses this syllogistic technique of mistating my position to avoid the real issues, and that he does so with full awareness. Consider the following passage taken from his letter verbatum:

> "Page 20, argument 12: Unless the whole canon is preserved, then the Mass is invalid. And the whole canon is not preserved, therefore the new mass is invalid.
>
> COMMENT: (that is, your respondant's own comment)
> There is little point in rep;ying, since the writer himself admits, page 21, that this is not true. He has virtually admitted the same thing when he declares that the celebrations of other rites is valid, although their Eucharistic prayers are different from the Roman Canon. Finally, the author has already admitted in the previous argument that provided the essential elements of the sacrament are present, the rite is valid... and he was obviously refering to the words of consecration."

It would seem that your respondant understands me very well, yet despite this he would misrepresent my position to avoid the issue. My point was, on page 20, argument 12, that should the Church wish to make certain changes in the Mass, they should at least leave the Canon alone, "that Sacred Canon, so pure from every error, that nothing is contained therein which does not in the highest degree savour of a certain holiness and piety, and raise up unto God the minds of those that offer...composed out of the very words of the Lord, the traditions of the Apostles, and the pious institutions also of holy pontiffs." (Council of Trent, Session XXII).

10 Again, the same straw man. The fact that we are copying the heretics in our liturgical forms is offensive and sacrilegous. It does not per se make the New "mass" invalid. However, I agree with your respondant on one point he makes here. The

concilium clearly did not share my opinion about Protestant theology and liturgy. (I intend no slur on Protestants as individuals.) Neither did the Second Vatican Council. My obsession is not with Protestantism, but with the Catholic faith. The obsession with Protestantism is the Council's and the Concilium's. Immitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

11 I did not discuss "Eucharistic Prayer" Nos. 3 and 4 because your respondant never claimed that they were either traditional nor a return to primitive practice. He only raised the issue with regard to Hippolytus' Prayer or Eucharistic Prayer No. 2. I do not intend to go into these alternative Erzatz Canons in depth as I feel I have made my point several times over and because he will only argue that because I reject these other Canons, therefore the New Mass is invalid. However, I shall give one example from them to show that they are true to the "spirit of Vatican II and the Novus Ordo," and that with them also the question (?) of sacrilege can be raised.

Considering the fact that as Jungmann says in his book Handing on the Faith, "the entire teaching of the Church is contained in the liturgy," and considering the constant teaching of the Church about the nature of the Trinity, let us compare Eucharistic Prayer Number IV with the Traditional Canon.

Novus Ordo	Traditional Canon
Father in heaven, it is right that we should give you thanks and glory; You alone are God, living and true..."	It is truly meet and just, right and profitable unto salvation, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O holy Lord, Father Almighty, everlasting God. Who, with the only begotten Son and the Holy Ghost, art One God, One Lord: not in the oneness of a single person, but in the trinity of One substance..."

Now this is a most instructive piece of skuldruggery. In the Latin version of the Novus Ordo the words are "Unus Deus," or "one God... living and true." In Latin then, no explicit heresy is taught. However, even in the Latin, the faithful are not clearly taught the doctrine of the Trinity. Your respondant will argue that the doctrine of the Trinity is alluded to in the Creed. Yes I agree, it is alluded to in the Creed, but it is certainly not expressed there with the same precision and clarity of thought (what a stricking economy of language is used in our traditional Canon). If Canon IV (i.e. Eucharistic Prayer No. 4) is used, this doctrine is nowhere else taught. However, when we come to the vernacular, the translating of Unus Deus as "You alone are God" is not only a mistranslation, but an explicit teaching of HERESY. It is a clear cut denial of the doctrine of the Trinity. (Look up the meaning of "alone" in the dictionary. Your respondant will claim this is a "simplification of format." Bravo! I have never denied that Protestant theology was more simple. I will even grant your respondant that this teaching is a "return to primitive practice." Indeed it is, but not to the primitive practice of the Church; only to the primitive practice of the ARIAN HERETICS. Truly, it is meet and just to refer to this Fourth Eucharistic Prayer as the ARIAN CANON - though it is certainly not profitable unto salvation for it to be used.

12 I shall leave it to the reader to compare the two prayers, Eucharistic prayer No. 2 and Hippolytus' prayer. That is why I placed them side by side in my second letter. As to whether the two prayers are "essentially" the same, I can do no better than to again quote modern liturgist John Barry Ryan (who is on your side, not mine) to the effect that the Second Eucharistic prayer is "a new creation," only superficially based on Hippolytus's original.

Please understand, it is not any single specific word change that I object to

in these various erzatz Canons - but rather the totality of word changes that essentially change the nature of the entire rite, making it possible to understand it only as a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." To quote the critique of the Roman theologians (the "Ottaviani Intervention"):

> "The three ends of the Mass are altered; no distinction is allowed to remain between Divine and human sacrifice; bread and wine are only "spiritually" (not substantially) changed... The Real Presence of Christ is never alluded to and belief in it is implicitly repudiated."

Yes indeed, as Cardinal Ottaviani (who was prefect or director of the Sacred Congregation for the Faith under three Popes) says, the Novus Ordo "represents both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass..." The idea that it has "only changed a few words here and there" is patently absurd. First of all, as noted on page 10 of my second letter, these "few" words are in fact somewhere between 75-80% of the Mass, and secondly, even with regard to what remnants are left in the Novus Ordo, the word changes we have discussed above are not without significance. We can argue ad infinitum about individual words, but it is impossible to deny but that the resulting liturgy fails to express the Catholic faith explicitly and openly.* Nor can you deny that we are left using a "doubtful" form in the Consecration, and that to use a doubtful form when we have a certain one is in itself an aspect of Sacrilege.

13 The issue of "for us" and its use in the deleted prayer Quam Oblationem is discussed rather thoroughly on page 7 of my second letter. I have nothing further to add to this. With regard to the issue of the Epiclesis, I shall discuss this in section 17 of the present letter.

14 For your respondant to imply that I feel the New Mass is invalid because the concept of thanksgiving is not central to the rite is pure hypocracy. He has on two occassions accused me of being illogical. His whole attitude to this issue is a series of non sequetors. It is he who initially raised the issue of thanksgiving being "central" to the Mass in his attempt to defend the Novus Ordo which clearly makes the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" central. It is I who corrected him on this point on page 7 of my second letter (last paragraph), and I shall quote my own passage:

> "I concur that the "central concept of thanksgiving" (his phrase) was Christic in origin, but I don't concur that the concept of of thanksgiving was central to the institution of the Mass..."

I have never asserted that the new "mass" was invalid because it is refered to as "Eucharist" i.e. thanksgiving. I am not sure whether your respondant is trying to be sarcastic or humorous, for if he intends neither, he is simply intellectually dishonest. If however, the central concept of the Mass is to be thanksgiving and not the "sacrifice of Christ, then the meaning of the Mass is grossly distorted. This one act of distortion may in itself destroy validity. It is however but one of a series of distortions that have resulted in the creation of a monstrosity - truly as Paul VI describes his mass, it is a "mutation". (c.f. footnote, page 10, this letter).

---

* To quote Pope Pius XII's Encyclicap Mediator Dei, "in the sacred Liturgy we profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly."

15 Again your respondant distorts my intention along the lines discussed in section 9 of this letter. Really, this type of argument beggars belief. I would expect it from a Loisy or a Turrell, but hardly from someone you would select. Let us review the ~~the~~ issue:

I stated in my initial letter that the Novus Ordo was in many, if not in most respects, a skillful blending of the Lutheran and the Anglican liturgies. Your respondant denied this. In my second letter I proved the contention. He now distorts the issue by stating that my contention is that "Luther hated the Catholic Mass, therefore the renewed rite is invalic." Let us be honest. It was he that wished to defend the Lutheran liturgy that is being foisted on us as "Catholic," not I. However, I can at least suggest that Luther would have been pleased with the New "mass". Certainly he would have been a welcome "observer" at the Concilium, and he would have approved the recent change in the Lutheran service made to bring it into line with the Novus Ordo - for the Lutherans have changed "many" into "all mankind" in their Words of Institution! Perhaps one could call this an example of "Religious detente".

It is not I, but the New Church, that is obsessed with Luther, as is shown by its avowed intention, as put in the words of Cardinal Willebrands,"TO REHABILITATE LUTHER!" If I am obsessed with anything, it is in preserving the fullness of the Faith, for myself and for my children - a "zeal for my Father's house," and not a zeal for Lutheran teaching. The New Church cannot claim a unity with "our separated brethren," simultaneously with a unity with the Apostles. And we, the laity, cannot serve two masters.

16 Again, your respondant distorts the issue. After all, it was he that claimed that the sacrificial nature of the new "mass" was clearly shown by the phrase "Quod pro vobis..." (see his first letter, page 3, paragraph 6), words which the Novus Ordo has added to the traditional form of the Words of Consecration. While this addition doesn't change the meaning in se of the words, it is also clear that no Catholic theologian has ever claimed that this phrase was "substantia." I do not deny that St. Paul said these words, or that they are to be found in other forms of the Words of Consecration. The point I made in my second letter is that Luther who clearly denied the sacrificial nature of the Mass (he called it an "abomination") also added these very words because in the context in which they were used by him (and the Novus Ordo emulates this context), the phrase allowed for the stressing of the "narrative" aspect of the Mass - the only aspect that he (Luther) would accept. The reader is refered to the quotation from Father Wathen's book given in section 5 above to see how this criticism applies now. Further, it is precisely in the light of such changes that Paul VI's statement takes on greater import:

> "re-editing in a new manner liturgical texts tried and tested by long usage... (imparts) greater theological value to the liturgical texts (of the Novus Ordo) so that the (new) lex orandi conformed better with the (new) lex credendi."

17 Again, instead of complaining about my "customary lack of logic," I think we should stick to the issues. Clearly you concede that the Novus Ordo has utilized many of the changes introduced into the Anglican liturgy - indeed that it has copied them almost verbatum. Note however that I do not accuse you of saying that because of this the English (Anglican) rite is Valid. I begin to strongly suspect that you do consider it a valid rite, for after all, does it not have what you consider the essential words? Let me ask your respondant a serious question. Would he be willing to say the Anglican or Lutheran service as a Catholic priest, with the intention of consecrating. From his position, I can see absolutely no reason why he wouldn't. If his answer is yes, then clearly he commits a sacrilege. If his answer is no, then I would like to know why not. Perhaps there are a few words here and there in the Reformed services that he objects to. For myself, I cannot find any significant difference between the

Anglican and Lutheran rites and the Novus Ordo. On this one point I agree with the Lutheran pastors that do not find any difference. This is a serious request and not an attempt to be sarcastic.

The issue of the Epiclesis seems to me to be a complete "red herring." The Epiclesis is a prayer "in which the celebrant prays that God may send down the Holy Spirit to change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of His Son." The concept of the Epiclesis is not required for a valid consecration. Let me quote Tanquerey:

> "It is also certain, that for a valid consecration, the epiclesis is not required, the prayers through which the priest asks that the bread be changed into Christ's body, the wine into blood."

Some Greek Orthodox theologians have argued that it is essential for consecration. Rather than debate the issue, I have enclosed as Appendix IV the statement on it by the Catholic Encyclopedia. In passing however, I shall add that it is only a personal opinion that the Quam Oblationem represents the Epiclesis in the Roman Canon, and that in any event, the Quam Oblationem has been obliterated by the innovators.

18 Again, you raise a false issue, and again I refer you back to paragraph 9. Of course I accept that when Christ said "quod pro vobis... effundetur" He was refering to His Body and Blood, and to the Sacrifice of Calvary. I doubt very much that the new breed of priests in using these words will however understand, within the context of the Novus Ordo that

> "the form of this sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this sacrament, except to pronounce the words of Christ." (Summa III, Q. 78, Art. 1)

19 Again, you raise a false issue. I ask anyone to read page 10, section f, and your response to it and conclude otherwise than that you are again trying to avoid the issue and impute to me a false contention. Moreover, you compound this offence against the truth by again quoting the passage from the Council of Trent that deals with the issue of Communion under two species. A translation of this passage is given on page 16, section 5 of this letter, and the complete chapter is given in Appendix II. This section from the Council of Trent can in no way be used to justify the wholesale destruction of our traditional Mass. It deals only with the "manner of dispensing the Sacrament of Holy Communion, the substance remaining unchanged." I have never raised the issue of whether the Church had any rights to change the manner of dispensing Communion, and I fully accept the teaching of the Council of Trent on this issue. I do of course have serious objections to "communion in the hand" which I can see in no way as being "for the profit of those who receive, or for the veneration of the said sacrament..." but that is another question. The word "abhorrence" refers to innovations, including those in the Novus Ordo. This is further discussed in section 23 below. I am deeply sorry that your respondant doesn't share this abhorrence.

Finally, the concluding remark of the present Pontiff to the effect "that nothing has been changed in the essence (of the Mass) may be technically correct if he means that the words "This is My Body... This is My blood" are still retained. However, such a statement can also be applied to the Anglican and the Lutheran services, and such a statement is, to use the words of Father Parente, "aequivoca, captiosa, male sonans, scandalosa, perniciosa and periculosa." (cf. section 2, this letter).

20 Here again your respOndant resorts to his favorite manner of distorting the issue - and with full awareness of what he is doing. Again, I refer the reader to section 9 above. He stated in his response to my first letter that "it is simply not true as it stands that the Lutherans and others find nothing they object to theologically in the new order." I showed rather conclusively on page 11 of my second letter that it was true. I assume he concedes this point. Now, if the Lutherans and others object to the traditional Mass and not to the New "mass", perhaps your respondant will also concede that something significant has changed in these two rites - or at least that the new rite is sufficiently equivocal as to allow for misinterpretation on the part of our "separated brethren." He now, instead of admitting this, claims that this alone is the basis for my claiming that the new rite is invalid. I admit that this fact would raise serious doubts about validity in my mind, but I have proved "invalidity" on the basis of the very criteria your respondant has specified (in section 5 of this letter). The issue of whether the Protestants like our traditional Mass or the New "mass" is entirely irrelevant to me. The fact that they approve the theology of the New "mass" shows that the New "mass" is either heretical, or it can be interpreted in a heretical manner. Hence it follows that, knowing this, to say the New "mass" is from the Catholic viewpoint, an act of Sacrilege. For a priest to knowingly commit sacrilege would of course invalidate any intent upon his part to "do what the Church intends." The New "mass" is clearly invalid according to the criteria of St. Thomas Aquinas simply on the basis of the change in the meaning of the substance of the Form of Consecration. It may also be invalid because it is sacrilegous

21 As to the Document on Ecumenism, I have read it carefully several times. The only thing that it states to support the new kind of ecumenism it advocates is that "grace to be had from it sometimes commends it." It quotes no Scriptural passages in favor of communicatio in sacris and I should be most interested in any your respondant can provide, either from the Document, or from the entire Canon of Scripture.* I can of course quote several passages, as I have done, that speak against it. Let me quote you a passage ontthe issue from Theologia Morale by J.B. Vittrant, S.J. (1953):

> "Any formal involvement - no matter what the circumstances - with either heresy or error (infidelite) is a very grave mistake. One cannot formerly assist in either a non-Catholic form of worship, nor in the propagation of non-Catholic ideas. (Formal assistance exists when a Catholic participates in such an act interiorly or with his heart. Material assistance is said to occur when cooperation is merely physical or external).
>
> "One should avoid with great care any risk whatsoever of perversion or scandal (lectures, associations, etc.,) (The danger of perversion exists for example, when simple souls can conclude that all Christian Churches are valid, or if one is led to believe that it is not important for one's salvation whether one is Catholic, Protestant or Schismatic. The danger of Scandal exists, for example, should a non-Catholic participate in a Catholic service and the faithful are led to believe that the Church recognizes the pastoral authority of the minister of a non-Catholic sect. It is also scandalous for for a Catholic to formerly participate in a non-Catholic service.
>
> "It is necessary to guard with great care all the existing proscriptions that the Church holds and teaches in order to safeguard the faith. This is why, in practice, one is never allowed actively to cooperate with a ceremony that is clearly non-Catholic. All such cooperation that

* The traditional attitude of the Church is well expressed by Father B.W. Maturin, an Anglican convert of some prominence. The Church, he states, "has always considered it a kind of sacrilege to partake of the most sacred rite of her religion with those who in any way tampered with the Divine Truths of Revelation."

> is formal or scandalous is clearly forbidden by divine law. (The Church cannot dispense one of the obligations of a negative divine law - i.e. of a law which forbids a certain course of action - writer.)"

And opposed to these teachings (consider especially paragraph two quoted above) are certain clear-cut statements of the Decree on Ecumenism:

> "The brethren divided from us also carry out many of the sacred actions of the Christian religion. Undoubtedly, in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or community, these actions can truly engender a life of grace and can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation."
>
> "Religious freedom has its foundation in the dignity of the person. The requirements of this dignity have come to be more adequately known to human reason through centuries of experience..."
>
> "Witness to the unity of the Church very generally forbids common worship to Christians (i.e. communicatio in sacris), but the grace to be had from it cometimes commends this practice... most valuable to this purpose are meetings of the two sides - especially for discussion of theological problems - where each can treat with the other on an equal footing."

How can a Church, any Church, that believes it has the Truth, and the Fullness of Revelation, take such a compromising stand - unless it has lost that very Faith it was meant to guard and pass on?

22 You have repeated this false syllogism to me so often that now I am beginning to believe it. I refer you back to section 9, above.

23 I find myself absolutely shocked by your respondant's statements that "many saints have been great innovators." The more so when he gives as examples the names of St. John of the Cross, St. Theresa of Avila, St. Francis and St. Domenic! Either he doesn't understand and recognize the Platonic distinction between "new songs," and "new kinds of music," or he refuses to use the word in the manner that the councils and the saints throughout history have. Pray, what innovations did any of these saints introduce? Perhaps the Rosary! or Holy Poverty! Listen to the words of St. John of the Cross:

> "One should be distrustful of ceremonies unapproved by the Catholic Church (He was of course refering to the Church of All Times - writer)... Persons should not desire new methods as if they knew more than the Holy Spirit and His Church... Let them be convinced that God will not answer them even if they invent new ceremonies..."
>
> Ascent of Mount Carmel

Or St. Theresa who willingly submitted all her works to the inquisition lest they contain any error:

> "Half-learned confessors have done my soul great harm. When I have been unable to find a confessor with as much learning as I like, I have come to see by experience that it is better, if they are virtuous and observant of holy customs..."
>
> Autobiography

I have read all that St. Francis has written (not that much actually) and St. Domenic has left us no writings.* It is easy to throw such accusations around against the saints (it borders on blasphemy), but you have not given me one quotation from a saint in favor of "novelties". Let me give you one reason why you cant. The law of Pope Urban VIII with regard to the canonization of saints states that

> "a most diligent inquiry be made as to whether the servant of God whose canonisation is sought wrote any books, tracts, meditations, or the like; for if any such have been written no enquiry is to be carried on until such books are carefully examined by the Congregation to see whether they contain any errors contrary to faith or morals, or any novel doctrine opposed to the sound and pure teaching of the Church.

Finally, I shall give you one last quote from Pius XII's Mediator Dei to which your respondant refers me in his letter, and which therefore I assume he respects as an authority:

> "We observe with considerable anxiety and some misgiving, that elsewhere certain enthusiasts, over eager in their search for novelty, are straying beyond the path of sound doctrine and prudence. Not seldom, in fact, they interlard their plans and hopes for a revival of the sacred Liturgy with principles which compromise this holiest of causes in theory or practice, and sometimes even taint it with errors touching Catholic faith and ascetical doctrine."

He should read the Novus Ordo Missae!

I have not admitted that Latin was an innovation, and a careful reading of page 12 of my second letter should make this abundantly clear.

The appropriate use of the term "innovation" or "novelty" implies "heresy." Thus when Paul VI describes the Novus Ordo Missae as "A great innovation indeed," he is proclaiming that it in some significant way departs from the spirit and standard that has prevailed among the Church Fathers, among the saints, among the Popes that preceeded him ("Let there be no innovations," as Pope Sylvestor said in post-Apostolic times, and as Pope Benedict XV said in recent times), and in the Ecumenical Councils. Consider the following statement of the Seventh Ecumenical Council:

> "Let everything that conflicts with ecclesiastical tradition and teaching, and that has been innovated and done contrary to the examples outlined by the saints and the venerable fathers, or that shall hereafter at any time be done in such a fashion, be anathema!"

---

* I do not know whether your respondant would consider St. Bonaventura as a good son to St. Francis, but he followed St. Francis as a director of the order and wrote the official biography of St. Francis. Let me quote from him a pertinent passage: "Preacher should discover nothing new in their hearts, for our Lord did not create new loaves to feed the crowd. He multiplied the five loaves that were at hand. So it is that true doctrine must be drawn out and multiplied through prayer which rises up to heaven, through devotion which blesses, through meditation which breaks the bread, and through preaching which distributes it."

Let us consider with trepidation the following quotation from St. Augustine:

> "It was not I who devised (any teaching of the Church - St. Augustine refers to original sin - but for instance we could use the phrase "the teaching of the Church about judgment after death"), which the Catholic faith holds from ancient times; but you who deny it, are undoubtedly an innovating heretic." (De Nupt. II)

Yes indeed, in a saner age, to describe the Novus Ordo as an Innovation, was to condemn it outright, to state that it was not Catholic and that it was despiciendus - to be passed by and avoided.

24 Yet again, the straw man!

25 Yes, I deny any need to adapt our religion and our Mass - the former of which is True and the later of which incorporates this Truth into our Liturgy - to the exigencies of changing times. This does not mean that certain of the ceremonies cannot be changed, or that we cannot return to communion under both species providing it is for the "profit of those who receive, or for the veneration of the said sacraments." What it does mean is that our Faith cannot change. Listen to the de fide statement of Vatican I:

> "The meaning of the sacred dogmas must always be retained which Holy Mother Church has once taught, nor may it ever be departed from under the guise, or in the name of deeper insight... If anyone shall say that, because of scientific progress, it may be possible at some time to interpret the Church's dogmas in a different sense from that which the Church understood and understands, let him be anathema!... The doctrine of the faith which God has revealed has not been proposed to human intelligence to be perfected by them as if it were a philosophical system, but as a divine deposit entrusted to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted."

You will of course demand that this only be applied to things which are de fide definita. I hold that it refers to the entire deposit of the faith. Now, as we have mentioned previously, it has frequently happened during the course of history that the Church has defined a dogma only when it was attacked. God help us, what would we do if we returned to "primitive practice" prior to these declarations and definitions. We conld deny anything we wanted!

Further, this modern world to which you would have us adapt, owes its very existence to its rupture with the Church - that is to say, it is founded on principles that reflect a basic infidelity to Christ. The Church cannot adapt itself to all this infidelity without becomeing adulterous and calling upon itself all the strictures that Jeremias laid upon the Jews that had become a "generation of Harlots." The absurdity of the adaptionist position is seen if we propose that the father of the "prodigal son" should go eat husks with the swine. It is these very "husks" that one chokes on in the New Church. The Church can only kill the fatted lamb when modern man returns to the bosom of the Father. "God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself," (2 Cor. v:19) and not vica versa.

The absurdity as well as the real intent of those who are attempting to "adapt the Church" to modern times is further demonstrated by the fact that these are the very same people who cry the loudest about the need to "return to primitive practice." This two-pronged attack upon our faith by these neo-modernist Pelagians and Montanists (each claiming louder than the next that "the Holy Spirit is with him.") calls to mind the proverbial candle that is burnt at both ends. At some point nothing is left in the middle!

Returning to the issue of the Mass, the core of the Mass has been since Apostolic times the Canon (which contains the Words of Consecration and a proper setting in which they may be used). Of course there are other traditional Canons such as are to be found in the various Eastern rites that also provide an appropriate setting for the Words of Institution. However, I am a Roman Catholic and so intend to remain - so help me God - and this despite the New Church. However, here again your respondant displays his tendency to warp the issue. Refering back to his first letter, he stated that the Novus Ordo represented "a return to the earlier discipline existing for centuries prior to the reform of Trent." I amply demonstrated that this was an outrageous falsehood. Indeed, I challenged your respondant to show me one prayer in the Novus Ordo that represented such a return, and he has failed to do so.

The only returns to primitive practice that are pushed by the New Church are those that will result in destruction of the Faith and loss of respect for the Holy Eucharist. If we are to return to primitive practice, let us return to all of them. Let us go back to saying Mass in the Catacombes, and to all night vigils, and to the laity saying the office. Let us return to the vigor of the Lenten fasts and the life of prayer and sacrifice. One can imagine how well the modern world would adapt to such practices!

26 Again your respondant imputes to me the contention that the removal of the words mysterium fidei from the form of the Sacrament makes the sacrament invalid. Here however, he states within the same section that this is not my position! I have already covered much of this issue in section 5 above. The removal of these words from the substance of the form (St. Thomas considers them substantial), however offensive, doesn't change the meaning of the form-ula and hence does not render the rite invalid. There removal nevertheless remains offensive and has been condemned by the Church as late as 1958. Consider the Monitum (warning) of the Holy Office:

> "The Supreme Sacred Congregation has learned that in a certain translation of the New Order of Holy Week into the vernacular, the words "mysterium fidei" in the form of the Consecration of the chalice are omitted. It is also reported that some priests omit these words in the very celebration of the Mass. Therefore the Supreme Congregation (part of the Universal Magisterium of the Church) gives warning that it is impious (nefas) to introduce a change in so sacred a matter..."

And such is only natural for as it says in De Defectibus, Chapter V

> "If anyone adds or takes away anything (from the form of the Consecration of the Body and the Blood), even if he does not change the meaning of the form, he does confect (the Sacrament), but he sins grievously."

Yesterday a grievous sin and a nefarious act. Today a virtue!

Further, my objection to their displacement is based also on the fact that the context in which they are said in the Novus Ordo, allows for an ambiguous and therefore for an eroneous interpretation. Their placement just after the Consecratory Formula followed immediately by the statement "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again" clearly suggests to the simple faithful that mysterium fidei refers, not to the presence

of Christ "whole and entire" on the altar, but to the final coming and return of Christ at the end of time. Now, of course I believe that Christ will return (and bearing a sword to boot), and I am aware that the phrase is from St. Paul, but I strongly suggest to you that its placement here, while not teaching overt heresy, clearly distorts the teaching of the Church and the intent of the Apostles that placed this phrase within the consecratory form-ula.

As to your respondant's quotation from the Council of Trent, Session 13, Chapter II, I can refute his contention that it is pertinent to this issue by quoting it more fully:

> "Wherefore, our Saviour, when about to depart out of this world to the Father, instituted this sacrament (the Eucharist), in which He poured forth as it were the riches of His divine love towards man, making a rembrance of His wonderful works; and He commanded us in the participation thereof to venerate His memory, and to show forth His death until He come to judge the world..."

How this statement justifies the displacement, I cannot understand

Since your respondant again raises the issue of the relationship of the Words of Consecration to the Synoptic descriptions, let me refer him back to the passages quoted in section 5 of this letter, and especially the quotation taken from the authority he himself recommends, namely Jungmann's The Mass of the Roman Rite. Let me further note that this compulsion to abandon tradition in favor of Scripture is and always has been a hallmark of the Reformers and heretics. If anything should be changed, the Synoptic versions should have been brought into line with Tradition (I can hear the observors at the concilium howling!). Finally, let me again quote St. Thomas Aquinas:

> "The Evangelists did not intend to hand down the forms of the Sacraments (in Scripture) which in the primitive Church had to be kept concealed... their object was to write the story of Christ." (Summa III, Q. 78, Art. 3)

27,28 I apologize for not understanding the point your respondant made in his initial letter. (A theologian that I consulted on this statement also found it confusing, and the two of us spent over an hour trying to figure out what you meant). I think I do now understand what you are saying. My response to this was however perfectly appropriate for I merely expressed the teaching of the Church with regard to what could be considered "narrative" and what was spoken (namely the form of the Words of Consecration) "as a present affirmation by the priest speaking in the person of Christ..." Clearly, within the Novus Ordo, the entire service can be considered "narrative" and should it be said as a narrative only, no consecration would occur.

29 I am amused that for the first time your respondant asks me to prove my contention from traditional sources. Let us first deal with the issue of a "virtual" intention. This is a technical term. Using Pohle as our authority, the priest has an actual intention of performing a rite when he sets out to do what the Church intends. Should he become distracted however, he may be assumed to have a virtual intention, the "force" of which derives from his previous "actual" volition. In the present discussion, the issue of "virtual intention" is another "red herring."

What I meant to say, and think I said quite clearly, is that within the context of the traditional Mass, it was quite clear what the Church's intention was, and the priest in using the traditional words would clearly have to make a contrary intention

to avoid confecting the species (which would of course be sacrilege). Now, I would again ask the reader to review the lengthy discussion and quotation taken from Father Wathen's book in section 5 above. I do not think the intention of the traditional Church is clearly expressed in the Novus Ordo and hence it falls upon the priest to make an actual intention of doing, not what the Novus Ordo specifies, but what he knows to be the intention of the traditional Church, if any consecration is to occur. If the priest does not believe in transubstantiation he would not be able to make such an actual intention - and in using the Novus Ordo he is not clearly provided with the traditional Church's intention. This perhaps better explains the statement of the Critique of the Roman theologians (the "Ottaviani Intervention") which again I quote:

> "The words of consecration, as they appear in the context of the Novus Ordo (in Latin) may be valid according to the intention of the ministering priest. But they may not be, for they are so no longer ex vi verborum (by the force of the words used) or more precisely, in virtue of the modus significandi (way of signifying) which they have had till now in the Mass. Will priests who, in the near future, have not had the traditional training and who rely on the "Novus Ordo" in order to "do what the Church does," (remember again in Latin - writer) make a valid consecration? One may be permitted to doubt it."

Enclosed is a letter written to the Wanderer (June 16, 1977), a "conservative" New Church publication (i.e. speaking on your side of these issues) which discusses the issue of intention clearly. (Appendix V) Whatever the Catholic reader may think of our correspondence, he would do well to consider its contents carefully. Remember, it is written by one who would defend the New "mass".

30-31 Again, the straw man!

32 This issue has been adequately covered in section 5 of this letter, as well as in the appropriate sections of my second letter. I again must assume since these "essential" words are to be found in the Anglican and the Lutheran services, that your respondant would not object to saying these services and would consider that should he do so the "mass" he said was valid.

Since your respondant refers to the Encyclical Mediator Dei, let me quote one other passage from this for his consideration.

> "But it is His will, besides, that the worship He instituted and practiced during His life on earth, shall continue ever afterwards without any intermission."

The worship He (Christ) instituted is to be found in the various forms of the traditional Mass, and not in the services created by Luther, Bugnini or the English Reformers. As to the other points, they are covered in section 5 above.

33 At last the straw man is exposed and your respondant admits that I have in at least three places made it reasonably clear that I do not claim invalidity on the basis of the many and clear defects that prevail in the Novus Ordo outside of the Words of Consecration. Validity is one thing. Sacrilege is another.

34 Back to the straw man again! I would suggest that your respondant will find that the Canon - the traditional Roman Canon, contains the "unchangeable elements"

that were spoken of in the documents of Vatican II.

35 Back to the straw man again - yet! If after reading all the evidence I have brought together within the body of these letters, and considering the fact that one must always choose a certain form over a dubious one, if your respondant still feels comfortable with the Novus Ordo, then I must respect his individual conscience, a conscience formed by his own private opinions and not by the teachings of the traditional Church. Let him continue to say the Novus Ordo, but let him not claim that he does it as a faithful Catholic.

36 This is getting silly!

37 It is quite clear that your respondant cannot refer me to a single document that refutes the Critique of the Roman Theologians that carries the title of "The Ottaviani Intervention." That such a damning document should have been abroad for 9 years without a host of refutations can only be called extraordinary. His claim to have refuted this document within the body of his letters, if true, would make his letters one of the most important contributions to the New Church possible. I consider his response here a "cop-out".

As to Cardinal Ottaviani's submission to the Pope, I have no knowledge of this. He is an old man (and perhaps has long gone to receive his martyre's crown) and if still alive, is close onto 90, blind and infirm. Clearly it is within his rights to retire from the battle and for him to say the traditional Mass sine populo (as the innovative phrase in the Novus Ordo puts it - that is without a congregation). Even if he had signed a retraction (assuming he could read what he was signing), THE DOCUMENT ITSELF STANDS AS A CHALLENGE - AND AFTER NINE YEARS, AN UNANSWERED CHALLENGE TO THE NEW AND POST-CONCILIAR CHURCH.

38 We have debated at great length the issue of validity. Now, even if your respondant were to convince me that the phrase "for you and for many" was not part of the "substantia," or that the New Church had the right to change the form or the substance of the sacraments (fixed as they have been with regard to the Mass since Apostolic times, and certainly since the Council of Florence), or that many and all men mean the same thing, or that Christ meant all men when He said many, he would still only convince me that the Words of Consecration were valid. After that he would have to convince me that the setting in which these words were used was not sacrilegous. Validity of itself does not make the Novus Ordo worthy, nor does the use of the Words of Consecration in a proper form make the use of the Novus Ordo representative of "the worship He (Christ) instituted and practiced during His life on earth..." (Mediator Dei). Remember "The victims of the wicked are abominable to the Lord" (Proverbs xv:18). To understand this point, let us consider a statue of a favorite female saint: If we were to take this statue and paint it to look like a harlot, the statue would still be one of the saint in question, but it would neither be licit nor worthy. This analogy may seem extreme to the reader, but it is most precise. To validly consecrate within the framework of the Novus Ordo is to desecrate Our Lord. It would be according to St. Thomas, the gravest of all forms of Sacrilege (Summa II, Q. 99, Art. 3).

Of course I am aware that many faithful Catholics do not see the issue this way. The reason for this is explained by St. Hilary of Poitiers who said in the year 364:

> "Christ's people... take the words which the heretics use to denote the faith which they themselves hold. The ears of the people are holier than the hearts of the priests."

In their innocence, the faithful are unaware of what is going on. The changes have been brought about slowly, and the words of the New "mass", being a "parody", sufficiently mimick and resemble those of the traditional Mass, so that it isn't always easy to detect the significant words and changes. The fact that the priests still wear some (not all) of the traditional vestments, and that the table (not altar) is covered with one (not three) cloths will easily pass without notice, as will the absence of an altar stone containing the relics of the martyres. Even when the obvious is pointed out to them, they choose to look the other way. The entire issue is too painful for them to accept. Finally, their priests, in whom they habitually place an implicit trust, have betrayed them. All these subterfuges have their precidence in the activities of the Lutheran and Anglican Reformers who also claimed to be "returning to primitive practice."

I reject out of hand the contention of your respondant that my presentation lacks logic and that I am unfamiliar with the traditional theology and hence am not really able to understand the issues.

39 Again, I am shocked! Your respondant may not be able to convince me of the justice of his position, but he certainly can surprise me. He states that I "seek refuge in a new definition of the faith refusing that of traditional theology..." Now the definition I used in my second letter and which he objects to is taken from the Catholic Encyclopedia and is essentially that of St. Thomas Aquinas; I give it again:

> "Faith may be considered both objectively and subjectively. Objectively it stands for the sum of truths revealed by God in Scripture and Tradition and which the Church presents to us... Subjectivly, it stands for the habit or vitue by which we assent to these truths."

I shall take a definition from another source, namely Msgr. G. Van Noort's Dogmatic Theology:

> "The subject matter of divine-catholic faith are all those truths proposed by the Church's magisterium for our belief as divinely revealed... The act of saving faith is elicited by the intellect, at the command of the will, and under the help of divine grace."

and Van Noort further quotes the First Vatican Council to the effect that:

> "By divine and Catholic faith everything must be believed that is contained in the Written Word of God, or in Tradition, and that is proposed by the Church as a divinely revealed object of belief either in a solemn decree (i.e. de fide definita) or in her ordinary universal teaching."

Nothing in such a statement precludes my accepting his "notae theologica," or the statements I quote from Canons 1322-24, or frm the Encyclical Mortalium Animos. I would suggest that section 4 of this letter be again reviewed. His rejection of St. Vincent of Lerins definition, what is believed by all, at all times and everywhere is most surprising as most textbooks of theology refer to this statement. His comment about the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is most inappropriate as had this belief not been part of our Tradition, it could never have been defined as de fide definita. And would your respondant deny the august mystery of the Trinity because it is not de fide definita? (It is not as is pointed out by Pope Pius XI in the Encyclical Mortalium Animos as quoted on page 5 above.) Also, as I pointed out earlier, your respondant is a great believer in "returning to primitive practice," and should we follow his logic with regard to this, we could reject almost anything we want. His argument that one does not have to believe something is true until the Church defines it as being de fide is NOT CATHOLIC TEACHING

Consider the words of Pius XII in his Encyclical Humani generis:

> "Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in encyclical letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: 'He who hears you, hears me'; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in encyclical letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic Doctrine."

Finally, let us consider the words of the act of faith which the Church has used since time immemorial:

> O My God, I firmly believe in all that your holy Catholic Church approves and teaches since it is You the infallible truth, who revealed it to your Church."

No Catholic can reject the definition of the Faith that I have given any more than he can reject the act of faith. No Catholic can limit his faith to only "teachings previously declared 'de fide'". I have no obligation to show that the Council teaches against teachings de fide definita and need only show that it teaches contrary to the revealed word of God. This it clearly does both in the area of communicatio in sacris and in the area of religious freedom. I could show many areas indeed where Vatican II departs from the ordinary teaching magisterium of the Church, but feel that the discussion on page 24 of my second letter adequately demonstrates this and assume that your respondant also agrees that it does since he challenges me only to show its falsity in areas de fide definita.

Your respondant then goes on to raise the shibboleth of the question of the "Immaculate Conception." I call it a shibboleth because I am tired of the implication that St. Thomas may have been wrong about a great many things - after all, he was wrong about the Immaculate Conception. There are several things to be said about this issue. First of all, it is by no means entirely clear just what St. Thomas taught about the Immaculate Conception. The best discussion of the issue that I have found is "The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception," Historical Development and Dogmatic Fulfilment, by Rev. Bernard A. McKenna, Catholic University of America, 1929. Secondly, the doctrine, while not de fide definita, was clearly held by a great many saints in the Apostolic Church and was certainly within the provinence of Tradition. I hope that had I been alive before the proclaimation of Ineffabilis Deus, the Apostolic Letter defining this dogma, I pray God I would have had the necessary grace to have done so. Your respondant forgets that "the scope of infallibility is to preserve the deposit of faith revealed to man by Christ and His apostles," (Catholic Encyclopedia) and that, to quote Cardinal Newman, in defining something as infallibly true,

> "Another limitation is given... in the Pastor Aeternus... the proposition defined will be without any claim to be considered binding on the belief of Catholics, unless it is referable to the Apostolic depositum, through the channel of either Scripture or Tradition.

With regard to the Syllabus, your respondant is quite correct in noting my error both with regard to the Pope involved, and to the inclusion of the Syllabus under the stricture. Unfortunately I miscopied my own notes.

The Syllabus represents a difficult subject to discuss within the confines of a letter such as this. Clearly Vatican II teaches contrary to it. For the sake of

brevity I enclose as Appendix VI the article in the Catholic Encyclopedia. I shall make a few brief comments. There are two Syllabus containing propositions that are condemned, that of Pius IX and that of Pius X. As to the first, its title in full is "A Syllabus containing the most important errors of our time, which have been condemned by our Holy Father Pius IX in Allocutions, at Consistories, in Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters." With regard to it, theologians have debated as to whether all of it, or only most of it, can be considered infallible. To quote the Catholic Encyclopedia, "Even should the condemnation of many propositions (in it) not possess that unchangeableness peculiar to infallible decisions, nevertheless the binding force of the condemnation in regard to all the propositions is beyond doubt. For the Syllabus, as appears from the official communication of Cardinal Antonelli, is a decision given by the pope speaking as universal teacher and judge to Catholics the world over. All Catholics, therefore, are bound to accept the Syllabus. Exteriorly they may neither in word nor in writing oppose its contents; they must also assent to it interiorly. With regard to the Syllabus of Errors (Lamentabili sane exitu), issued by Pius X, it is "a doctrinal decision of the Holy Office, i.e. of that Roman Congregation which watches over the purity of Catholic doctrine." It was ratified by Pius X on July 4, 1907 and in November of the same year, in a Motu Proprio he prohibited the defence of the condemned propositions under the penalty of excommunication, reserved ordinarily to the Pope. Further, in the "Oath against Modernism," which Tanquerey considers part of the Solemn Magisterium (i.e. de fide definita - it falls under the category of a Creed) every priest in the traditional Church (the New Church no longer requires it) had to swear:

> "I also submit myself with due respect and I adhere wholeheartedly to all the condemnations, declarations and prescripts contained in the encyclical Pascendi and the decree Lamentabili, particularly those refering to the so-called history of dogma."

Finally, one can legitimately consider both the documents in question to be infallible, for despite the fact that they have not been specifically declared as such, it is a teaching of the Church that

> "the Church is infallible when it condemns a certain proposition with some doctrinal censure. A Doctrinal censure is 'a qualification or restriction which indicates that a proposition is opposed, in some way, to faith or morals.'"
>
> Tanquerey, Dogmatic Theology

Clearly the Syllabus has been and has to be adheared to by faithful Catholics, and clearly neither your respondant nor Vatican II does.

41 I shall not write to Father O'Leary. First, I am truly weary of this polemic, and secondly, under the circumstances outlined in my letter to Mother Theresa (at the start of this letter), it is not my place, but hers to do so.

42 Yes, I admit that the present Pope has spoken out against Communism and Heresy. But let me quote you a passage from a popular song - "Do not talk of love, show me!" While you can show me an occassional statement against Communism, I have already given several examples (page 37, second letter) of where his actions have clearly encouraged the spread of this "intrinsicly perverse" heresy within the confines of the New Church. Such activities alone, in the Age of Faith, would easily have brought about his condemnation, if not have condemned him to the stake. He has openly fraternized with the bestial ministers of Communist governments, whose official policy

is one of world imperialism and whose avowed aim is to remove from the face of the earth all traces of the Catholic Church. These white-collard savages, whose hands drip with the blood of literally millions of Catholic and Christian martyrs, and whose every move and every word is admittedly inspired by a hatred of Christ, now receive the open hospitality of the Vatican - a hospitality paid for with the donations of a passive but intrinsicly faithful laity. (The diversion of funds collected from unweary Catholics to the Communists through Catholic agencies is documented by The Wanderer, April 28, 1977.) I would insist that before you discuss this issue further, you read Alexander Solzhenitsyn's "Warning to the West" and another recent book, "Murder in a Gentle Land". The only bulwark against the spread of Communism in the West has been the traditional Roman Catholic Church. With all the Pope's conciliary "negotiations" and platitudes, truly "the fort is betrayed, even of them that should have defended it" (St. John Fisher).

Now, as to the various statements of the present Pope, I can quote him on both sides of almost any issue you like. Pale faith speaks with forked tongue, as an old quip goes. Let us consider as a case in point what he has said on the issue of the Mass:

> "The Church, therefore, with the long labor of centuries and the help of the Holy Spirit, has established a rule of language confirming it with the authority of the councils. This rule, which has often been the watchword and banner of orthodox faith, must be religiously preserved. Let no one presume to change it at his own pleasure or under the pretext of new science. Who would ever tolerate that the dogmatic formulas used by the ecumenical councils for the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation be judged as no longer appropriate for men of our times and therefore permit others to be rashly substituted for them? Likewise, it cannot be tolerated that any individual should on his own authority modify the formulas used by the Council of Trent to express belief in the eucharistic mystery. These formulas, like the others which the Church uses to propose the dogmas of the faith, express concepts that are not tied to a certain form of human culture, or to a specific phase of scientific progress, or to one or other theological school. No, these formulas present that part of reality which necessary and universal experience permits the human mind to grasp and to manifest with apt and exact terms taken from either common or polished language. For this reason, these formulas are are adapted to men of all times and places."

Words truly worthy of a Pontiff. Taken from his Encyclical Mysterium fidei , we have an excellent example of Christ speaking through Peter. Yet, despite this, we have the Novus Ordo Missae!

43 Rene Voillaume is the co-head (or was) of the Little Brothers of Jesus and Mary, the order that Charles de Foucauld had hoped to establish. He is, I believe, one of the finest adherents of the New Church. If we cannot trust the words of such a man, who can we trust in the New Church. Certainly, according to you, not Bernard Haring. As to Bernard Haring, he may have been criticised by L'Osservatore Romano, but he is currently teaching at Fordham University, and as such forming the souls of both the clergy and the laity. He is a heretic who wears the cassock of the Church - a veritable wolf in sheep's clothing.

44 I have read the section that your respondant recommends in Corinthians . It is of course a favorite passage of the Pentecostals. His defence of this strange manifestation makes me wonder whether perhaps he considers himself one of them. In any event, I enclose as Appendix VI a recent article of mine on this subject which

discusses this topic, and this passage from scripture, in some detail. For me, a Catholic Pentecostal is a contradiction in terms, rather like a "Christian Atheist."

45 Re Hans Kung: This reminds me of the physician who is clearly known to be incompetant. He is criticised by his colleagues, but no one stops him from practicing. Of course, Hans Kung is so far out that even the extremists in the New Church no longer pay him much heed. He is almost a joke. But what about Karl Rahner (whose Theological Dictionary is a compendium of modernist heresy and as such is published with a Nihil Obstat) or Avery Dulles, S.J. who has publicly denied his belief in the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of Our Lady, and yet continues to teach at the Catholic University of America. I have a whole list of similar cases.

46 I accept the correction that your respondant makes in this paragraph.

47 I accept the criticism here. I should have double checked my sources. I may of course still be quite correct in my accusation, but I cannot prove it incontrovertably. While not "substantial" to our discussion, it represents a defect in my presentation which I shall not defend.

48 This whole paragraph is a reiteration of what has been said by your respondant many times, and has been refuted by me several times. Your respondant persists in confusing fundamental changes in the prayers of the Mass with ceremonial changes of an "accidental" nature. He persists in quoting Chapter II of Session XXI of the Council of Trent - a Session that deals with the issue of Communion under one or two species - as justifying the wholesale destruction of our traditional Mass and its replacement by a "mutation," an "innovation" and a "parody".

CONCLUSION

As I draw this correspondence hopefully to a close, I gladly admit that your respondant has made several factual corrections in my presentation - surprisingly few however considering that I am neither a theologian nor a scholar. He has made many insinuations about my reasoning ability and integrity as well as about the thoroughness with which I have investigated the issues. These I reject. He has suggested that I am not Catholic which I deny.

On the other hand, he has further convinced me of the justice of my position in tenaciously holding to the traditional teachings of the Church and in making my norm for judgment both Tradition and Scripture as interpreted by the traditional theologians of the Church. He has in no way convinced me that the New Church is the Church that Christ founded.

Clearly there are two Churches existing side by side, and both claiming to be the true Church. One is the neo-modernist and neo-protestant Church of the Novus Ordo. Those that would defend it must accept the opprobium of being labeled neo-modernist and neo-protestant. As opposed to this there is the traditional Church whose members take pride in being "hide-bound" and rigid about Traditional matters. Are we not meant to be rigid about Truth? And would your respondant deny the teaching of the Catechism of the Council of Trent to the effect that "Holy Tradition is the interpreter and guardian of the truth?" I am afraid he would. This is a choice that neither he

nor the Pope can demand of me.

Of course, I admit that I have not convinced him of the justice of my position, and do not believe that further correspondence will change either of us. Should he however wish to raise further points, I remain willing to discuss them. I would hope however that we can both consider the correspondence closed at this time.*

I feel we have both had ample opportunity to express our views. I shall submit this material for publication because, despite the fact that we have not come to a consensus of opinion, the material we have both presented is so critical to the understanding of the present crisis in the Church. He cannot object to this as I made it clear in my initial letter that this was my intention regardless of the outcome of our debate. Further, since he claims to have refuted the Critique of the Roman Theologians (the "Ottaviani Intervention"), I think he should welcome such an opportunity.

May God help us all to live His Truth, His Way, and His Life.

---

* I have not answered the Letter of Pope Paul VI to Archbishop Lefebvre which your respondant sent. This because it would involve repeating much of what has been already said within the body of this correspondence, and further because the letter is sent to hi and not to me. He has answered it and further correspondence between him and Paul Vi has occured that has not been published. Those who are interested in the writings of Archbishop Lefebvre are refered to his books, currently in French, but soon to be available in English. Particularly recommended are "j'accuse le Concile!" (Editions Saint-Gabriel, Martigny, France, 1976) and "Un Eveque Parle," (Ecrits et Allocutions, 1963-1975, Jarze, France, 1976: Editeurs Dominique Martin Morin). A more recent text that I have not as yet read, is Le Coup de maître de Satan: Ecône face à la persécution. I further think it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to answer the Pope's letter to this great man.

APPENDICES

I	Discussion on *many* and *all*	Patrick Henry Omlor
II	Session XXI of the Council of Trent	
III	*Notitiae* on the six-non-Catholics	
IV	Note on the Epickesis from Catholic Encyclopedia	
V	Letter to *The Wanderer* on Intention	
VI	Note on the Syllabus from Catholic Encyclopedia	
VII	Article on Pentecostalism by R.P.C.	